

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS
IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By

MARY ANN KANE LINZMAYER

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1978

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her gratitude and appreciation to all those who have helped to make this study possible. In particular, the writer wishes to acknowledge the encouragement and guidance given so generously by the chairman of her doctoral committee and director of the thesis, Dr. Ralph B. Kimbrough. The writer also wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. William C. Childers and Dr. James L. Wattenbarger for their advice and counsel.

The writer is especially grateful to the educators who participated in the study, and without whose cooperation the investigation would not have been possible.

A special thanks to Dr. George R. Conger for his expert advice and Dr. Audrey R. Johnson for her encouragement and Ms. Norma W. Dew and Ms. Kathleen W. Ritch for their valuable editorial help.

To my husband, George, and my children, Juliet and John, I extend my loving appreciation for their patience and support.

Finally, the writer would like to thank her parents, Mr. and Mrs. V. H. Kane, for their many years of guidance and love.

M.A.K.L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Delimitations	3
Limitations	4
Justification	4
Assumptions	6
Definition of Terms	7
Comprehensive Community College	7
Learning Resource Center	7
Services	8
Organization of the Research Report	8
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Development of Learning Resource Centers	9
Definitions of Learning Resources Centers	10
Evaluation Attempts	14
State and Regional Accreditation Attempts	17
Chapter Summary	19
III INSTRUMENT AND PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY	21
Development of the Instrument	23
Collection of the Data	25
Analysis of the Data	26
IV ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	28
Presentation of the Data for All Colleges Responding	29
Facilities Contained in the Learning Resource Centers	29
The Administration, Staffing and Con- dition of Facilities of Centers	31
Practices Concerning Budgeting and Financing for Functions in the Centers	36
Library Policies and Services	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Materials Production Facilities	45
Audio-Visual Services	46
Student Media Lab	47
Comparison of East and West Groups	49
Advisory Committee	49
Housing	50
Salary Allocation	51
Periodical Subscriptions	52
Reading Instruction	53
Speaking Instruction	54
Tutoring Services	55
Learning Lab Rating	56
Graphics Production	57
Slides Production Rating	58
Number of Distributions	59
Audio-Visual Services Rating	60
Chapter Summary	61
 v SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES	62
Summary	62
Findings	64
Component Facilities	64
Advisory Committees	64
Administrative Configurations	64
Ratings	65
Staffing	65
Policies	66
Financing	66
Libraries	67
Learning Laboratories	68
Materials Production	69
Audio-Visual Services	69
Student Media Lab	70
Findings Concerning Geographical Differences	70
Conclusions	72
Recommended Guidelines	73
Philosophy	74
Administration	74
Financing	75
Libraries	75
Learning Laboratories	76

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Instructional Design and Development	76
Instructional Support	76
Evaluation	77
APPENDICES	78
APPENDIX A	80
COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEARNING RESOURCE	
CENTER QUESTIONNAIRE - 1977 (With	
Tabulated Responses Where Appropriate)	
APPENDIX B	108
LETTERS OF REQUEST	
APPENDIX C	113
PARTICIPATING COLLEGES	
REFERENCES	116
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	120

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Frequencies and Percentages of Facilities Existing in Learning Resource Centers	30
2. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Philosophy, Condition of Facilities, and Administration of the Learning Resource Center	33
3. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Financing of the Learning Resource Center	36
4. Frequency of Percentage Category for Total of Learning Resource Center Budget for Print Media	37
5. Frequency of Percentage Category for Total of Learning Resource Center Budget for Non-Print Media	39
6. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding College Library Included in Learning Resource Center	40
7. Frequency and Percentages of Days of the Week and Hours of the Day That the Library Is Open	42
8. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Learning Laboratory Included in the Learning Resource Center	43
9. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding Materials Production Included in the Learning Resource Center	45
10. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Audio-Visual Services Included in the Learning Resource Center	47
11. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Student-Media Lab Included in the Learning Resource Center	48

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
12. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with LRC Advisory Committees Having Student Members	50
13. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with LRC Housing Type	51
14. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Salary Allocation	52
15. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Number of Periodicals to Which Library Subscribes	53
16. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratories Offering Instruction in Reading	54
17. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratory Offering Instruction in Speaking	55
18. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratory Offering Tutoring Services	56
19. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratory Staff Descriptors	57
20. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Number of People Involved in Graphics Materials Production	58

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
21. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Slides Production Staff Descriptors	59
22. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Number of Distributions Per Term from the Audio-Visual Section	60
23. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value for the Association of Geographical Area with Audio-Visual Services Descriptors	61

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS
IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By

Mary Ann Kane Linzmayer

June, 1978

Chairman: Ralph B. Kimbrough

Major Department: Educational Administration

The purpose of this study was to determine functional guidelines for the realistic evaluation of learning resource centers in community colleges. The sub-problems in the study were as follows:

1. What were the services provided and administrative arrangements of exemplary learning resource centers in selected comprehensive community colleges of selected states?
2. What guidelines for services and administration of learning resource centers were suggested from a review of the literature and research?
3. What importance was placed upon proposed services by a jury of experts?
4. What impact did regional differences have on existing learning resources programs?
5. What practical guidelines should be used for the realistic evaluation of services of learning

resource centers in the comprehensive community college?

To be able to determine guidelines which could be used in future evaluations, it was necessary to determine the nature of exemplary community college learning resource centers as they currently exist. A careful study of the literature revealed that there was no instrument exactly appropriate. A comprehensive questionnaire of original design was developed to assess the diverse and multiple aspects of today's community college learning resource program.

With the use of expert opinion, 10 states were selected from among those with well-established community college systems: California, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia and Washington. The state director for community college programs for each of these 10 states was asked to nominate those institutions in their states which they believed had exemplary learning resources programs.

Media production as well as an audio and video tape library was the facility found most often to be a part of existing learning resource centers. The library was found to be included 94.1 per cent of the time. A program of individualized instruction was a part of the Learning Resources in 84.3 per cent of the programs. A clear majority

(81 per cent) of the learning resource centers function as independent departments under the auspices of academic affairs. Over half (53 per cent) reported a total budget, excluding salaries, of over \$75,000.

Almost three-fourths (74 per cent) of the libraries used the Library of Congress cataloging system. Approximately 50 per cent of the respondents stated that the library was not open at any time during the weekend. More than 90 per cent of the learning laboratories (individualized instruction) were open both during the week days and evenings.

Only four per cent indicated the LRC staff responsible for the actual operation of audio-visual equipment in the classroom. Ninety eight per cent reported having audio-visual services available for instructional purposes during the evening as well as during the day.

The following paragraphs describe the statistically significant differences found between the colleges located east of the Mississippi River and those colleges located west of the Mississippi River.

Western colleges had the learning resource center housed in its own building more often than did the eastern colleges. Western colleges also had significantly higher salary allocations than did eastern colleges. On the other hand, eastern colleges more often offered instruction in reading, speaking and tutoring services.

Based upon the results of the study, the writer recommended 26 guidelines for the evaluation of learning resource centers in the community college.

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Public comprehensive community colleges have become a common phenomenon in American education. The community junior college movement began over seventy years ago and its rapid growth has been exceptional. The services of community colleges have expanded to meet the diverse needs of increased student enrollment. (Culkin, 1974)

One such service, the library, provided the instructional support necessary during the early years of the movement, but with the increase in the numbers of students, the information explosion and post-World War II technical advancements, the library of the community college is now expected to provide the services appropriate to the demands made by a more sophisticated instructional process.

During the early stages of community college development, the library sought to keep pace with expertise which did not go beyond books, periodicals and film strips. When this proved insufficient, an attempt was made in many colleges to make non-print materials available in separate storage areas outside of the walls of the library, and, in some cases, a "media specialist" was even employed. This development spawned a necessary evolutionary phase best characterized by

a spirit of separation. Fortunately, the maturation process has progressed to the point where library and media specialists have now joined together through professional organizations, university education programs, and college administrations to form a united and uniform approach for making print and non-print materials easily accessible for students and teachers. (Raines, 1973)

During the past decade, phrases such as "multi-media library," "school research centers," "instructional materials center," and "learning resource centers" have become familiar parts of the educational jargon. They reflect the rapidly changing patterns of methods employed to accommodate the increasing emphasis on new media. Consequently, traditional libraries have grown into resource centers with a broader yet unified program of services using various resources and incorporating both audio-visual and printed materials.

(Shifrin, 1974)

Statement of the Problem

The problem under consideration was to determine functional guidelines for the realistic evaluation of learning resource centers in community colleges. The sub-problems in the study were as follows:

1. What were the services provided and administrative arrangements of exemplary learning resource centers in selected comprehensive community colleges of selected states?

2. What guidelines for services and administration of learning resource centers were suggested from a review of the literature and research?
3. What importance was placed upon proposed services by a jury of experts?
4. What impact did regional differences have on existing learning resources programs?
5. What practical guidelines should be used for the realistic evaluation of services of learning resource centers in the comprehensive community college?

Delimitations

The following restrictions were observed in conducting this study:

1. The study was confined to a selected group of public comprehensive community colleges.
2. By requesting nominations of exemplary community college learning resource centers from ten state community college directors, the author received nominations of jurors who are expert in the field of learning resources.
3. The data were limited to a study of the learning resource services of selected community colleges of 10 states located east and west of the Mississippi River on the assumption that differences may

appear between the older, more traditional colleges of the East and the newer, possibly more innovative colleges of the West.

4. The study was restricted to the validity of the selection of the jury of experts.

Limitations

The study was limited to the expertise of selected jurors, the data collected from the study of selected community college services, and the review of the literature.

Justification ✓

Learning resource centers have attempted to meet the rapidly growing need for instructional support services in comprehensive community colleges. However, what services should be offered and how they should be evaluated are two factors which, heretofore, have not been determined.

A variety of services of learning resource centers have evolved from attempts by librarians, media specialists and others to meet the need for providing easy accessibility to print and non-print instructional materials and related supportive services. (Clinton, 1972)

The expanding developments in electronic technology for the rapid retrieval and transfer of stored audio, visual and printed information have brought a variety of instructional patterns of utilizing this technology. (Davies, 1974)

Learning resource centers are evolving into an integrated media system composed of library, television, and audio-visual services. The modern community college learning resource center seeks to enrich, vitalize and humanize the educational program by providing a supportive service. Effective guidelines need to be developed to evaluate the services of the integrated media system for students and faculty of the comprehensive community college. (Davies, 1974)

It has become apparent that there is a need for guidelines to be developed which incorporate an examination of services of learning resource centers. These guidelines could then be used to evaluate existing learning resource center services, in order that the latest learning media techniques may be used in the most effective manner.

A multi-dimensional approach to education is essential in the comprehensive community college if the widely divergent learning needs of its heterogeneous student body are to be met. Librarians and media specialists have agreed that an integrated approach toward media would make the most recent developments in telecommunications readily accessible. This accessibility is important if the comprehensive community college is to be responsive to individual student differences. (Connelly and Sepe, 1973)

The information explosion, expansion of knowledge, the advances in the science of telecommunications, the increase in the heterogeneous nature of the student body, comprehensive programs in community colleges and recent trends toward accountability dictate that learning resource centers have progressive yet practical methods of evaluation. The development of any undergraduate learning resource center represents a complex and multi-faceted undertaking which may better be realized with an effective evaluating system.

(Shifrin, 1974)

This study has determined evaluation guidelines which should help learning resource centers in: 1) developing flexible administrative patterns; 2) improving accessibility of material; 3) providing media appropriate for student differences; 4) utilizing technological advances; 5) increasing instructors' knowledge and use of media.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine guidelines for the evaluation of existing learning resource centers which may also serve as guidelines for the planning of future learning resource centers in comprehensive community colleges.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study the following three assumptions were made:

1. That the data collected were sufficiently inclusive;
2. That the jury selected to respond was sufficiently informed concerning services of learning resource centers;
3. That the guidelines for use in evaluating the learning resource services which emerged from this investigation were based in part on a review of past efforts and existing standards, but their legitimization primarily reflects the diverse and extensive experience of the experts who participated as jury members.

Definition of Terms

Comprehensive Community College

A public two-year college which offers programs and/or courses limited to the first two years of post-high school education including the university-parallel program and at least one program or series of offerings of each of the following: occupational education or continuing education. For the purposes of this study, community college is synonymous with "junior college," and "comprehensive community college."

Learning Resource Center

An administrative configuration within a community college responsible for the supervision and management for learning resources units regardless of the location of these

components within various physical environments of the institution. This includes library, audio-visual, telecommunication instructional development facilities and instructional system components.

Services

The provision of information, material, equipment and performances related to instructional support.

Organization of the Research Report

This study is reported in five chapters. Chapter I includes an introductory statement, a statement of the problem, procedures, the definition of terms and the organization of the study by chapters.

A review and overview of the related literature and a summary is included in Chapter II.

Chapter III includes a discussion of the procedures, development of the instrument, collection of the data, and returns of the instruments.

Chapter IV is a summary of the findings.

Chapter V presents the recommended guidelines for the evaluation of learning resource centers in the community college.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the learning resources center in the community college is a recent development, it is not surprising that a review of the literature revealed only a limited number of research reports and articles related to the problem treated in this study. The establishment of the learning resources center has been an evolutionary phenomenon of fairly recent date in community college education. In order to study the development of the learning resources center, it is necessary to study the history of its development, to investigate the changing definitions of learning resources and to note some of the attempts at evaluating learning resources.

Development of Learning Resources Centers

Public comprehensive community colleges have become a common phenomenon in American education. The community junior college movement began over seventy years ago, and its rapid growth has been reflected in the constantly changing patterns and services of its libraries. During the early years of the community college movement, the library provided the instructional support necessary in traditional ways. The library served as a repository of information and provided services which did not generally go beyond books,

periodicals and filmstrips. Several factors combined to make these traditional library services inadequate: a dramatic increase in the number of students attending community colleges, the information explosion, and rapid technological advances. The library was called upon to provide service appropriate to a much more sophisticated educational environment. Soon an attempt was made in many colleges to incorporate some of the new media by providing a separate storage area, usually located outside the walls of the library. In some cases a "media specialist" was employed. Frequently the librarian and the "media specialist" saw their roles as distinctly separate, and very little, if any, communication or cooperation developed between them. Gradually, however, the need for shared expertise became apparent, and librarians and media specialists joined together through professional organizations, university education programs and college administrations to form a united and uniform approach for making print and non-print materials more readily accessible to students and faculty. More recently terms such as "school research center," "learning center," and "learning resources center" have become familiar to those actively involved in community college education.

Definitions of Learning Resources Centers

Although it is generally agreed that the concept of the community college library as simply a repository for books

is no longer viable, just what the evolving library will include, how it will be administered and what it will be called is still a matter for some debate. A variety of conceptualizations as well as names are in current use. In his article, "Conceptualizing the Learning Center," Peterson (1975) advocates the name "Learning Center" in an effort to heal the split between print and non-print media in an environment which emphasizes learning. Peterson sees the major components of the "Learning Center" as 1) library functions; 2) audio-visual services; 3) instructional development; and 4) promotion of innovative learning environments. (p. 3) In "The Learning Resource Center: Concepts and Designs," Ducote (1970) refers to the disagreement concerning the name. Ducote contends, however, that the real challenge lies in the development of a new program which will allow the new materials and techniques to be more effectively utilized by students and faculty. In a paper presented to the Annual Conference of the Western College Reading Association, See (1974) also refers to the general confusion of names and lack of agreement of function and services provided.

Regardless of the debate concerning a name, the literature reveals that there is a growing trend toward incorporating more than library and audio-visuals in the new concept. In her paper, "College Learning Skills: Frontierland Origins of the Learning Assistance Center," Enright (1975) writes of

the "Learning Center movement" (p. 2) which includes a Learning Assistance Center, which would offer such diverse services as tutorials, study aids and referrals to other agencies. It would also serve as a testing ground for innovative machines, materials and programs, and, interestingly, also act as a campus ombudsman. (p. 3)

Piazza (1975), in "Learning Resource Programs for Two Year Colleges: A Study of the Art," says that the former library has now evolved to learning resources which are recognized as being involved in all aspects of the instructional process. He relates that systems theorists have been examining feasible organizational patterns of hardware and software in an effort to determine how a more efficient system with comprehensive, flexible staffing patterns and with instructional systems packages will permit greater personal contact among resource guides, teachers, and students. Piazza also states that there is no set pattern for the organization of learning resources.

In an attempt to gather empirical information about the concept of the Learning Center, Peterson (1974, p. 4) sent a three page questionnaire to public and community colleges in the United States. The questions were designed to include four basic concepts:

- a) the provision of information through a library of media containing print, audio, video, microfilms, computer display;

- b) the provision of AV services, including media production and instructional support functions through hardware and software systems;
- c) the provision of a number of non-traditional learning environments and activities within the learning center;
- d) the provision of instructional development activity which includes a systematic analysis of learner traits and task conditions with a pursuant synthesis of a variety of individualized media and other learning activity into a highly definable and evaluable learning environment. (p. 3,4)

As a result of his survey, Peterson found that almost half (46.7 per cent) of those colleges responding contained all four parts of his conceptual model. Peterson's study also revealed that of those colleges responding, only 16.7 percent included instructional development as a learning resources function. In another article, "The Comprehensive Learning Center," Peterson (1975) defines what he sees as the emerging services of learning resource programs: 1) instructional development; 2) learning assistance programs; 3) an individualized skills program; 4) media-related activities in an independent studies program; 5) external degree programs; 6) inservice training. (p. 44)

Noting the trend toward the inclusion of instructional development in the learning resources program, Voegel (1975), in his article, "Some Value Considerations," warns that "too much attention is being paid to instructional development as an institutional end rather than a means." Voegel goes on to assert that "teaching and some learning will occur whether I.D. is around or not." (p. 88) Voegel views

instructional design as a process which could improve the production of learning materials and instructional development as a process to improve and define instruction.

The literature, then, indicates a lack of consensus by experts in the field concerning the exact nature of learning resources, its services, its definition, and even its name. The traditional community college library has been expanded to include widely varied components of the instructional process. The services of a community college learning resources center may include learning laboratories which provide individualized skills instruction, materials production, computer operations, television studios, cinematography, student media facilities, photography and graphics labs, media production, film, record and tape collections and many other aspects of instructional technology. The library and audio-visuals services are but a small part of today's learning resources program.

Evaluation Attempts

To study the development of the learning resources center in the community college, it is necessary to look at the role of the junior college library and the American Library Association's efforts to establish standards for its evaluation. Efforts to establish standards for junior college libraries began in 1930. (Lewis, 1975) Thirty years passed, however, before the first formal statement appeared:

"Standards for Junior College Libraries." These standards, issued by the American Library Association in 1960, provided the first definitive document on the subject of libraries in two year colleges. This document was prepared by the Committee on Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries and approved by the American Library Association in January, 1960. Because of this unilateral action, the American Library Association was subjected to much criticism from organizations such as the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (Lewis, 1975) The purpose of the "Standards" was to provide a guide for the evaluation of two year college libraries. The set of standards addressed itself to such areas as budgets, facilities, staff, organization, objectives, functions, collection, and services. The 1960 "Standards" uses quantitative measures for evaluation.

In 1968, the Department of A-V Instruction of the National Education Association (DAVI) prepared standards for educational media programs in colleges and universities. The draft proposal of this group served as a guide for the "Educational Media Programs in Junior Colleges" by the Audio-Visual Standards Committee of the Community-Junior College Library Administrators. This group developed a list of factors relating to criteria for media programs in community colleges.

Another major document in the field of learning resources evaluation is the "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs." (1972) This report was published in 1972 and was approved by the American Library Association, the Association of Educational Communications and Technology, and the American Association of Junior Colleges. These Guidelines are "diagnostic and descriptive" (p. 306) and stress the need for direction in the development of comprehensive learning resources programs in two year colleges. The document does not attempt to establish minimal standards but "to provide criteria for information, self-study and planning." (p. 306) The document states that "the role of the Learning Resources program is four-fold: 1) to provide leadership and assistance in the development of instructional systems which employ effective and efficient means of accomplishing those objectives; 2) to provide an organized and readily accessible collection of materials and supportive equipment needed to meet institutional, instructional and individual needs of students and faculty; 3) to provide a staff qualified, concerned and involved in serving the needs of students, faculty and community; 4) to encourage innovation, learning and community service by providing facilities and resources which will make these possible." (p. 307) This document also defines terms frequently used in learning resources programs. It provides general

statements of such areas as objectives, organization, budget, instructional systems components, staff, facilities and material.

In an article entitled "A Comparison of the 1960 Standards and the 1972 Guidelines for Community College Libraries," Lewis (1975) compares the two documents and concludes that the more recent document is a "watered down version of the efforts of three influence-seeking organizations."

In their article, "Using the Guidelines: A Study of the State Supported Two-Year College Libraries in Ohio," Clark and Hirschman (1975) report the development of a questionnaire using the "Guidelines for Two Year College Learning Resources Programs" as a basis. The "Guidelines," although commended by the authors, were found to be too broad. They felt a need for the "Guidelines" to be translated into measureable criteria and quantitative averages for groups of institutions. (p. 365)

State and Regional Accreditation Attempts

Efforts have been made at both the state and regional levels to establish guidelines for the accreditation of learning resources centers. In his paper, "The Impact of Regional Accrediting Agencies upon Libraries in Post-Secondary Education," Yates (1976) points out that the literature on library accreditation is sparse. He deplores

the lack of uniform and meaningful library accrediting standards. Yates asserts that regional association evaluators attempt to evaluate quantitatively although prescribed quantitative standards do not exist. In their efforts to evaluate fairly, evaluators frequently use quantitative standards which are external to the regional associations such as HEW, Clapp-Jordan, Washington State or the California formulae. These evaluations, he claims, would be more meaningful if they were based on some index of quality.

In a working paper entitled "Identification of Library Elements in Statements of Accrediting Standards--A Review of the Literature," Totten (1974) tabulates the specific elements considered by those agencies which are involved in the accreditation of college libraries. As late as 1972, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, was the only one of six regional accrediting associations which did not include non-print media as one of the elements of library accreditation.

The need for realistic evaluation of community college learning resources has forced some states to develop evaluative measures of their own. In a paper presented in January, 1976, Michael explained the "Planning and Evaluating Library System Service in Illinois Using the CIPP Model." CIPP is an acronym for context, input, process and product. The model was designed for assessing library services and for

formulating goals, objectives and criteria to measure program attainment. An adaptation of many previous planning and design models, the CIPP was developed by Ohio State University Evaluation Center.

In 1973, the State of California issued "Guidelines for a Non-Print Materials Core in a Learning Resource Program." California has had space utilization standards for the traditional community college library since 1966, but these standards made no provision for non-print media. The newer guidelines refer to the Learning Resources Center and include the traditional library as well as audio-visuals, study skills and tutorial services. These guidelines provide specific quantitative measures, such as square footage allotments which follow formulae based on "day graded enrollments."

Chapter Summary

The literature directly related to this study is limited both in primary and secondary sources. The rapidly changing role of library and audio-visual services of the community colleges makes information that is only two decades old hopelessly out of date. A look at the historical changes indicates the library has changed from a depository for books to become a resources center, unnamed and undefined, which may be involved in all phases of the educational process. Two of the most important works in the field,

"Standards for Junior College Libraries" and "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resource Programs," are found to be too narrow on the one hand and too broad on the other. State and regional accreditation and evaluation measures are found to provide criteria which are either too specific and quantitative or too broad and qualitative, thus making the results of their application difficult to interpret. Old problems and new challenges in the constantly changing and rapidly expanding learning resources program indicate a need for evaluative guidelines which can be both flexible and effective.

CHAPTER III INSTRUMENT AND PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

The present investigation was conducted to determine functional guidelines for the realistic evaluation of learning resource centers in community colleges. To be able to determine guidelines which could be used in future evaluations, it was necessary to determine the exact nature of exemplary community college learning resource centers as they currently exist. This was the most crucial part of the problem. A careful study of the literature revealed that there was no instrument exactly appropriate. Although surveys, questionnaires, standards and guidelines had been published, none was completely fitted to the problem in this study. Therefore, a major task facing the writer was the development of a questionnaire which would be comprehensive enough to include the diverse and multiple aspects of today's community college learning resources programs.

A second major task in undertaking the study was the problem of making the selection of the exemplary learning resource centers. The writer, under the guidance of her supervisory committee, decided to choose 10 states from among those with well-established community college systems. With the use of expert opinion the 10 states selected were:

California, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia and Washington.

A third task undertaken was the problem of determining which learning resource centers would best represent current exemplary learning resource programs. In consultation with her supervisory committee, the writer decided the state director for community college programs would be knowledgeable concerning the college programs in his/her state. Therefore, each of the 10 state community college directors was asked to nominate those institutions in his/her state which he/she believed had exemplary learning resources programs.

A fourth problem in conducting the study was to ascertain the impact, if any, of regional differences on the community college learning resources program. It seemed reasonable to assume that the East, with its long history of formal education, might exert a traditional influence on an area which was still being referred to as "library services" by traditionalists. On the other hand, the learning resources program in the West might be marked by the spirit of innovation and originality which frequently characterizes that region. Thus, the decision was made further to divide the sample and compare the two regions. Six states were grouped together to form the West and four states were grouped to form the East. The time-honored dividing line,

the Mississippi River, was used as the natural division, and significant differences between the two sections were investigated.

Development of the Instrument

After a review of the literature and consultation with informed persons in the field, the writer determined that appropriate guidelines for learning resources could be developed only if an instrument were developed to assess current exemplary programs. To be valid, such an instrument would have to include the following categories: philosophy; services; administration; financing; facilities; professional staff; support personnel; equipment; and policies. Since both the writer's own experience and a review of the literature indicated learning resources programs could include many aspects of the total instructional program, the instrument was designed to be as comprehensive as possible. The following learning resources subdivisions were incorporated in the instrument: library; learning laboratories (individualized instruction); materials production; media production; hardware repair; television studios; automatic retrieval (dial access); photography; graphics; cinematography; film libraries; film strip libraries; record libraries; multi-media production; audio tape and video tape production; slide processing facilities; student media facilities; student media laboratories; audio-visual services and others (such as computer operations, bookstore).

After due consideration, it also became apparent that the instrument could not be limited to questions with yes-no responses. Differences in college philosophies, programs and size, for instance, as well as other factors, would cause considerable differences in answers to questions regarding staffing and financing. Every effort was made, however, to design easy-to-answer questions.

The design of an instrument which would be comprehensive enough to include all of the above considerations was a major problem. Obviously the sheer length of such a comprehensive questionnaire would tend to discourage response unless it was organized carefully. After the list of factors to be included in the questionnaire was identified, an initial draft of the instrument was prepared. This draft was submitted to an expert in research design whose suggestions resulted in a revision of the instrument. This draft instrument was submitted to the writer's supervisory committee chairman, whose suggestions resulted in the change of several questions and the deletion of several others. In addition, the revised instrument was submitted to persons working in the learning resources field for their suggestions. Once the questions to be included in the instrument were finally decided upon, the design format was carefully considered. In order to make the questionnaire less formidable, the final instrument was professionally printed on 6 x 8 1/2

green paper in black ink. It was hoped that the attractively designed and commercially printed questionnaire would encourage participation in the study. (See Appendix A)

Collection of the Data

In order to determine exemplary learning resources in the 10 states selected for the study, letters were sent to the community college directors in those states asking them to nominate the community colleges in their states which they believed had exemplary learning resource centers. These 10 state directors nominated a combined total of 94 community college learning resource centers.

A preliminary letter was sent to the head learning resources officer in each of the 94 institutions which had been nominated by the state directors. The letter explained the study and asked these officers to participate in the study. (See Appendix B) After approximately a two-week period, the questionnaire was mailed to each of the 94 community college learning resource centers which had been nominated by the state directors. The cover letter enclosed with the questionnaire again explained the purpose of the study and asked for cooperation in its completion. (See Appendix B) Participants were further invited to make suggestions or offer comments in the space provided for that purpose or in letter form. Each participant was mailed a stamped, addressed envelope. Prompt return of the

questionnaires was requested. Participants were assured that information about specific programs would not be used separately but that such information would form a part of the total statistical report which would result from the study. In addition, each respondent was invited to request a summary of the findings. After a three week period, 51 of the questionnaires had been returned. A second letter was mailed to the non-respondents urging them to complete and return the questionnaires. (See Appendix B) No additional responses were received.

Analysis of the Data

In analyzing the data, the following questions were considered: What is the exact nature of exemplary learning resources centers? What is the opinion of the expert respondents concerning current learning resources programs? Are there any significant differences between exemplary learning resource programs located in the East as compared to those of community colleges in the West? What evaluation guidelines should be proposed?

In an attempt to answer the above questions, the items on each questionnaire were processed by computer. The raw data were taken from the research instruments, coded on standard 80 space coding sheets, punched on IBM cards and subsequently processed. In addition to the descriptive statistics, the chi-square statistic was employed to

determine statistical independence of the discrete variables. For every bivariate examined, geographical area was one of the two variables included in the analysis. Of course, this variable was dichotomous.

Thus the development of the study included determining how to select the learning resource centers that should be studied, developing an instrument comprehensive enough to be useful and not so formidable as to preclude participation by selected learning resource centers, encouragement of response by these colleges, and selection of appropriate statistical techniques to analyze the data received. At each stage expert guidance was sought to maximize the usefulness of the results.

CHAPTER IV ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The major purposes of the present investigation were to determine the exact nature of exemplary learning resource centers and to determine whether regional differences have any significant impact on the nature of these centers.

It may be helpful to state the problem and sub-problems once again. The problem under consideration was to determine functional guidelines for the realistic evaluation of learning resource centers in community colleges. The sub-problems were as follows:

1. What were the services provided and administrative arrangements of exemplary learning resource centers in comprehensive community colleges of selected states?
2. What guidelines for services and administration of learning resource centers were suggested from a review of the literature and research?
3. What importance was placed upon proposed services by a jury of experts?
4. What impact did regional differences have on existing learning resources programs?
5. What practical guidelines should be used for the realistic evaluation of services of learning resource centers in the comprehensive community college?

This chapter is organized into two main divisions. First, the data for all colleges responding in the study are presented and discussed. Second, the data for the colleges are presented and analyzed by region. The colleges were divided into two regions--those east of the Mississippi River and those west of the Mississippi River.

Presentation of the Data for All Colleges Responding

As was discussed previously, an extensive questionnaire was prepared to collect the data. (See Appendix A) Even though the questionnaire was very long and required a large amount of information, over 51 percent of the colleges responded. In view of the extensive information requested, this was believed to be a very good return and may have been the result of using the printed questionnaire.

In this section, the data for all of the colleges responding will be presented. Eleven tables were used to organize the data for discussion. The reader is now invited to consider these data.

Facilities Contained in the Learning Resource Centers

The facilities existing in learning resource centers of the colleges responding are presented in Table 1. Media production and an audio and video tape library were the two facilities found most often (96.1 percent of the time) in the centers. Seven other facilities existed in the centers over 90 percent of the time. These are: a library,

photography, a film-strip library, a record library, multi-media production, audio and video tape production, and audio-visual services. Only three facilities existed less than 50 percent of the time. These are: a student-media laboratory (19.6 percent), automatic retrieval (21 percent), and student-media facilities (37.3 percent). Cinematography facilities were included in less than 40 percent of the learning resource centers. Only 56.9 percent of the learning resource centers included facilities for slide processing.

Table 1. Frequencies and Percentages of Facilities Existing in Learning Resource Centers.

Facility	Included	Not Included	Percent	
			Included	Not Included
Library	48	3	94.1	5.9
Learning Laboratories	43	8	84.3	15.7
Materials Production	41	10	80.4	19.6
Media Production	49	2	96.1	3.9
Hardware Repair	43	8	84.3	15.7
Television Studio	40	11	78.4	21.6
Automatic Retrieval	11	40	21.6	78.4
Photography	47	4	92.2	7.8
Graphics	41	10	80.4	19.6

Table 1. Continued.

Facility	Included	Not Included	Percent	
			Included	Not Included
Cinematography:				
8 mm only	19	32	37.3	62.7
16 mm only	20	31	39.2	60.8
both 8 and 16 mm	5	46	9.8	90.2
TOTAL	44	7	86.3	13.7
Film Library	45	6	88.2	11.8
Film-strip Library	46	5	90.2	9.8
Record Library	47	4	92.2	7.8
Multi-Media Production	46	5	90.2	9.8
Audio and Video Tape Library	49	2	96.1	3.9
Audio and Video Tape Production	48	3	94.1	5.9
Slide Processing Facilities	29	22	56.9	43.1
Student-Media Facilities	19	32	37.3	62.7
Student-Media Laboratory	10	41	19.6	80.4
Audio-Video Services	47	4	92.2	7.8
Other	25	26	49.0	51.0

The Administration, Staffing and Condition of Facilities
of Centers

Table 2 shows that 65 percent of the learning resource centers had advisory committees, and of those, 91 percent

had faculty members serving on those committees. Administratively, 81 percent of the learning resource centers function as an independent department, and 11 percent serve as a subdivision of the library. Eighty percent reported being a part of academic affairs; none reported being a part of business affairs, and five percent reported being a part of student affairs. Sixty-five percent stated that the chief LRC officer reported to the vice-president or dean for academic affairs. Thirteen percent reported directly to the president; four percent reported to the head of student affairs, and two percent reported to the chairman of the English department. Ninety-six percent reported having a written job description with clearly defined responsibilities for the chief LRC officer.

Seventy percent considered the LRC facility adequate, and 28 percent described the LRC facility as too crowded or inadequate. Fifty-one percent reported the LRC materials and equipment as either limited and appropriate or adequate and appropriate while 49 percent reported materials and equipment to be plentiful and well-matched to college's needs.

Over 50 percent indicated a staff of professionals, paraprofessionals, clerical and part-time employees numbering between one and five. Twenty-five percent reported a professional and paraprofessional staff of between 11 and 25.

Almost half (48 percent) of the LRC's have a written policy for community service. Over half (51 percent) of the LRC's describe their role in providing community service as good or superior. Regular staff meetings are held by 80 percent of the LRC's. Sixty-one percent of the LRC's have staff manuals but only seven percent of these contain policy statements. Seventy-eight reported the staff participates in policy sessions, 94 percent in procedural decisions and 57 percent in personnel decisions. Adequate statistics, an LRC handbook and inventory records were reported by over 90 percent of the learning resource centers.

Table 2. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Philosophy, Condition of Facilities, and Administration of the Learning Resource Center.

Item	Percent
Advisory Committee for LRC:	
Yes	65
No	35
Advisory Committee Composed of Faculty: (of Centers with Advisory Committees)	
Yes	91
No	9
Administrative Configuration of LRC:	
Independent Department	81
Part of English Department	0
Part of Communications Department	0
Sub-Division of College Library	8
Other	11
Part of Student Affairs	5
Part of Business Affairs	0
Part of Academic Affairs	80
Other	15

Table 2. Continued.

Item	Percent
Chief LRC officer reports to:	
President	13
Vice-President or Dean for Student Affairs	4
Vice-President or Dean for Business Affairs	0
Vice-President or Dean for Academic Affairs	65
English Department Chairman	2
Other	16
Chief LRC officer has written job description with clearly defined responsibilities:	
Yes	96
No	4
Facility in which LRC is housed:	
Adequate and comfortable	38
Adequate except for one or two small inconveniences	32
Too crowded, uncomfortable	10
Inadequate	18
Other	2
LRC materials and equipment are:	
Outdated and inadequate	0
Limited, but appropriate	23
Adequate and appropriate	28
Plentiful and well matched to college's needs	49
LRC Staff composition:	1-5 6-10 11-25 Over 25
Professionals:	52 36 12 0
Paraprofessionals:	60 25 13 2
Clerical:	58 26 16 0
Part-Time:	68 10 17 5
Other:	40 20 33 7
LRC has written policy for community service:	
Yes	48
No	52
Best descriptor of LRC's role in providing community service:	
Superior	12
Good	39
Adequate	35
Less than adequate	12
Poor	2

Table 2. Continued.

Item	Percent
LRC staff has regular meetings:	
Yes	80
No	20
LRC staff has a staff manual:	
Yes	61
No	39
Included in staff manual:	
Policy statements	7
Procedural statements	36
Duty assignments	7
General Information	50
LRC staff participates in:	
Policy Sessions:	
Yes	78
No	22
Procedural decisions:	
Yes	94
No	6
Personnel decisions:	
Yes	57
No	43
LRC staff accumulates adequate statistics:	
Yes	92
No	8
LRC offers written handbook to faculty and students:	
Yes	94
No	6
Inventory records maintained on materials and equipment:	
Yes	94
No	6

Practices Concerning Budgeting and Financing For Functions in the Centers

In this section of the report, data are presented to reflect the way funds are budgeted in the centers for print media and non-print media. Writers usually feel that funds should be budgeted to assure quality in all operational areas of the center.

Table 3 summarizes responses regarding the financing of the learning resource centers. Over half (53 percent) reported a total budget, excluding salaries, of over \$75,000. Fifty-one percent reported that the dean or director of the LRC recommended budget allocations. Of those responding, 65 percent state that internal budget decisions are made by the LRC dean or director.

Table 3. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Financing of the Learning Resource Center.

Item	Percent
Total Budget Allocation (excluding salaries) for 1976-77 in dollars:	
0-4999	0
5000-9999	2
10000-24999	18
25000-49999	6
50000-75000	21
Over 75000	53
Persons recommending budget allocations:	
President	8
Vice-President or Dean	4
Dean or Director of LRC	51
Faculty Committee	0
Student Committee	2
Other	35

Table 3. Continued.

Item	Percent
LRC Internal Budget decisions made by:	
LRC Dean or Director	65
LRC Staff	27
Faculty Committee	0
Student Committee	0
Other	8

The division of the learning resource budget for print media is presented in Table 4. Most responses indicated that less than 10 percent of the budget was spent on the various subdivisions of print media. New requisitions was the only category which differed. Approximately 80 percent of the colleges responding stated that more than 10 percent of the budget was spent on new requisitions. The nearest competitors were "planning" with 36 percent above the 10 percent criterion and "supplies" with 26 percent.

Table 4. Frequency of Percentage Category for Total of Learning Resource Center Budget for Print Media.

Print Media	5%	5-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-100%	No Response
New Requisitions	1	5	10	9	6	20
Replacement	11	15	3	0	0	22

Table 4. Continued.

Print Media	5%	5-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-100%	No Response
Maintenance	9	4	2	2	0	32
Supplies	13	7	3	2	2	24
Production	9	6	1	1	0	34
Rental	13	2	1	0	0	35
Planning	6	1	4	0	0	40
Repairs	13	6	0	0	0	32
In-Serving Training	8	4	0	0	3	36
Travel	18	2	4	1	0	26
Contractual Services	13	3	0	0	0	35
Evaluation	6	0	0	0	0	45
Other	6	0	0	0	0	45

The division of the learning resource budget for non-print media is presented in Table 5. Most responses indicated that less than 10 percent of the budget was spent on the various subdivisions of non-print media. As in the budget for print media, new requisitions was the category that had the most responses over the 10 percent criterion. For non-print media though, the allocation (41 percent) was approximately half that for print media. Supplies (39

percent) and maintenance (33 percent) were the next two highest allocations of greater than 10 percent.

Table 5. Frequency of Percentage Category for Total of Learning Resource Center Budget for Non-Print Media.

Non-Print Media	5%	5-10%	11-25%	26-50%	50%	No Response
New Requisitions	8	5	7	1	1	29
Replacement	11	7	1	0	0	32
Maintenance	9	5	7	0	0	30
Supplies	7	7	6	3	0	28
Production	7	9	2	0	0	33
Rental	12	2	4	0	0	33
Planning	11	3	0	0	0	37
Repairs	9	6	2	0	0	34
In-Service Training	9	0	0	0	0	42
Travel	14	0	0	0	0	37
Contractual Services	11	0	0	0	0	40
Evaluation	6	1	0	0	0	44
Other	2	1	0	0	0	48

Library Policies and Services

Table 6 summarizes the data regarding the library. Almost three fourths (74 percent) of the libraries use the Library of Congress cataloging system while only 26 percent

use the Dewey Decimal system. All of the libraries reported having a photocopy machine available for use by students. Sixty-five percent have an electronic security system. Half (50 percent) have between 1,000 and 10,000 titles in each satellite collection. Fifty percent have over 20,000 titles in each satellite collection. Half (50 percent) can accommodate up to 100 students in each satellite library. Almost half (49 percent) reported having between 25,000 and 50,000 titles in the main collection. Twenty-five percent reported having between 50,000 and 100,000 titles in the main collection. Sixty percent served up to 10,000 students per term in the library. Five percent reported serving over 80,000 students per term. Seventy-five percent had a clearly defined written statement of purpose for the library staff.

Table 6. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding College Library Included in Learning Resource Center.

Item	Percent
Type of cataloging system:	
Library of Congress	74
Dewey Decimal	26
Other	0
Photocopy machine:	
Yes	100
No	0
Photocopy machine available to students:	
Yes	100
No	0

Table 6. Continued.

Item	Percent
Electronic security system:	
Yes	65
No	35
Number of Titles housed in each satellite collection:	
1000-4999	17
5000-9999	33
10000-14999	0
15000-20000	0
Over 20000	50
Number of students each satellite will accommodate:	
1-50	20
51-100	30
101-200	0
201-300	20
301-500	20
Over 500	10
Number of Titles housed in main collection:	
0-999	2
1000-9999	4
10000-24999	12
25000-49999	49
50000-100000	25
Over 100000	8
Number of students library serves per term:	
1-2499	19
2500-4999	19
5000-9999	22
10000-19999	16
20000-39999	8
40000-80000	11
Over 80000	5
Library staff has clearly defined written statement of purpose:	
Yes	75
No	25

The times during which a library, which is contained in a learning resource center, is opened is presented in Table 7. Approximately 50 percent of the respondents stated that the library was not open any time during the weekend. The weekend day on which the library was most frequently open was Saturday (45.3 percent). Only 13 percent of libraries were open on a weekend day after five o'clock in the afternoon.

Table 7. Frequency and Percentages of Days of the Week and Hours of the Day That the Library Is Open.

	Open During Daytime Hours		Open After 5:00 PM	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Weekdays Only	20	47.6	25	80.6
Weekdays and Saturday	13	31.0	1	3.2
Weekdays and Sunday	3	7.1	2	6.5
All Seven Days	6	14.3	1	3.2
None of the Seven Days	0	0.0	2	6.5

Table 8 summarizes the data regarding the learning laboratory. Over 80 percent of the learning laboratories had between one and five people involved in all job categories. More than 90 percent of the learning laboratories

were open both during the day and evening. Sixty-seven percent had a clearly defined written statement of purpose. Eighty percent of the learning laboratories were housed in a specially designed area. Sixty-three percent of the learning laboratories reported being housed in one area, 10 percent in two areas, 17 percent in three areas; three percent in four areas and seven percent in six areas. Fifty percent of the learning laboratories were reported as being housed in facilities which were adequate and comfortable, 22 percent saw their facilities as adequate except for small inconveniences, 19 percent thought the facilities too crowded and uncomfortable and nine percent regarded the learning laboratory facilities as inadequate. Eighty-three percent indicated their materials and equipment as being adequate or plentiful. Only 27 percent regarded materials and equipment as limited.

Table 8. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Learning Laboratory Included in the Learning Resource Center.

Item	Percent				
Number of LRC persons involved in:	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-25	Over 25
Planning	91	9	0	0	0
Administration	90	10	0	0	0
Professional	81	19	0	0	0
Paraprofessional	88	12	0	0	0
Clerical	87	7	0	6	0
Part-Time	90	5	0	0	5
Evaluation	80	13	0	0	7

Table 8. Continued.

Item	Percent
Learning Laboratory open during the day:	
Yes	97
No	3
Learning Laboratory open during the evening:	
Yes	93
No	7
Learning Laboratory has clearly defined written statement of purpose:	
Yes	67
No	33
Learning Laboratory housed in specially designed area:	
Yes	80
No	20
Number of areas in which Learning Laboratory is housed:	
One area	63
Two areas	10
Three areas	17
Four areas	3
Five areas	0
Six areas	7
Descriptor of facility in which Learning Laboratory program is housed:	
Adequate and comfortable	50
Adequate except for small inconveniences	22
Too crowded, uncomfortable	19
Inadequate	9
Learning Laboratory materials and equipment are:	
Outdated and inadequate	0
Limited but appropriate	27
Adequate and appropriate	40
Plentiful and well related to college's needs	33

Materials Production Facilities

Table 9 summarizes the data concerning materials production. Photography, graphics and instructional design were included more than 90 percent of the time. Almost all reported between one and five people in all job categories, except for 18 percent reporting between six and 10 people involved in production. Over half (53 percent) described their materials production facilities as either too crowded and uncomfortable or inadequate. Sixty percent regarded materials and equipment as adequate or plentiful. Fifty-eight percent had a clearly defined written statement of purpose.

Table 9. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding Materials Production Included in the Learning Resource Center.

Item	Percent
Affirmation of Equipment inclusion in Materials Production:	
Large Offset	37
Small Offset	36
Mimeograph	29
Ditto	39
Instructional Design	94
Photo-Copy	80
Collation	56
Binding	48
Plate Making	48
Photography	97
Graphics	97
MSTS	10

Table 9. Continued.

Item	Percent				
Number of people					
devoting time to:	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-25	Over 25
Planning	94	3	3	0	0
Administration	97	0	3	0	0
Management	94	0	6	0	0
Production	76	18	6	0	0
Clerical	94	3	0	0	3
Evaluation	96	0	4	0	0
Best descriptor of facilities in which Materials Production program is housed:					
Adequate and comfortable					31
Adequate except for small inconveniences					15
Too crowded, uncomfortable					39
Inadequate					14
Materials Production materials and equipment are:					
Outdated and inadequate					0
Limited, but appropriate					40
Adequate and appropriate					40
Plentiful and well matched to college's needs					20
Materials Production staff has clearly defined written statement of purpose:					
Yes					58
No					42

Audio-Visual Services

Table 10 summarizes the data in regard to audio-visual services. Only four percent indicated the LRC staff responsible for running equipment while 33 percent reported faculty responsible for running equipment. Fifty-one percent own a film cleaning and checking machine. Seventy-four percent have a clearly defined written statement of purpose. All

reported having audio-visual services available during the day and 98 percent available at night.

Table 10. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Audio-Visual Services Included in the Learning Resource Center.

Item	Percent
Person running equipment:	
Faculty	33
Students	2
LRC Staff	4
Faculty and Students	17
Faculty and LRC Staff	24
Faculty, Students and LRC Staff	20
Own film-cleaning and checking machine:	
Yes	51
No	49
Audio-visual services has a clearly defined written statement of purpose:	
Yes	74
No	26
Audio-Visual services are available during the day:	
Yes	100
No	0
Audio-Visual services are available during the evening:	
Yes	98
No	2

Student Media Lab

Table 11 summarizes the data regarding the student media lab. No lab reported more than three persons staffing the media lab. Fifty percent reported one staff member, 25

percent reported two staff members and 25 percent reported having three staff members. Forty-three percent offer credit for the media lab, and an equal number offer it for non-credit. All reported keeping the media lab open during the day while 86 percent have labs available in the evening. All labs reported having equipment available for student use for slides, video-tape, film production, graphics, photography and television production. Also, all labs reported having a clearly defined written statement of purpose.

Table 11. Responses in Percents to Items Regarding the Student-Media Lab Included in the Learning Resource Center.

Item	Percent
Number of people staffing the Media Lab:	
One	50
Two	25
Three	25
More than three	0
Media Lab for:	
Credit	43
Non-Credit	43
Credit and Non-Credit	14
Media Lab available during the day:	
Yes	100
No	0
Media Lab available during the evening:	
Yes	86
No	14
Areas available for direct student hands-on use:	
Slides	100
Video-Tape	100

Table 11. Continued.

Item	Percent
Film Production	100
Art (graphics)	100
Photography	100
Television Production	100
Student Media Lab has clearly defined written statement of purpose:	
Yes	100
No	0

Comparison of East and West Groups

As discussed previously, the colleges were divided into two groups for analysis. One group of six states were in the group west of the Mississippi River. The other group of four states was east of the Mississippi River. In the beginning of the study, some persons speculated that there might be clear-cut differences between the two regions due to a traditional influence in the east and a possible pioneer spirit of innovation in the west.

Tables 12-23 summarize the data in which there was found to be a significant difference between those community college learning resource centers located in the East and those located in the West.

Advisory Committee

The response by geographical area as to whether a learning resource center's advisory committee has student

members is presented in Table 12. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that student representation on learning resource advisory committees is associated with the geographical location of a particular college in the study sample. The data in the table demonstrate that the eastern colleges had students on advisory committees significantly more often than did the western colleges.

Table 12. Frequencies and Chi-square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with LRC Advisory Committees Having Student Members.

Students on Committee	Geographical Area		Sample Size	Percent
	East	West		
Yes	18	4	22	71.0
No	3	6	9	29.0
Sample Size	21	10		
Percent	67.7	32.3		

Chi-square = 4.831 df = 1 Significance = 0.028

Housing

The type of housing for the learning resource center by geographical area is presented in Table 13. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that type of housing is associated with the geographical location.

The data in the table demonstrate that the western colleges

had the learning resource center housed in its own building significantly more often than did the eastern colleges.

Table 13. Frequencies and Chi-square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with LRC Housing Type.

Housing Type	Geographical Area		Sample Size	Percent
	East	West		
Own Building	13	18	31	73.8
Housed in Various Buildings	9	2	11	26.2
Sample Size	22	20		
Percent	52.4	47.6		

Chi-square = 5.172 df = 1 Significance = 0.025

Salary Allocation

The amount of total salary budget allocation of a learning resource center for 1976-77 by geographical area is presented in Table 14. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that the amount of the total salary budget allocation of a learning resource center was associated with the geographical location.

The data in the table demonstrate that the western colleges had a significantly larger allocation for salaries than did the eastern colleges.

Table 14. Frequencies and Chi-square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Salary Allocation.

Budget	Geographical Area		Sample Size	Percent
	East	West		
0-\$24,999	0	2	2	4.2
\$25,000-\$49,999	1	1	1	4.2
\$50,000-\$99,999	9	2	11	22.9
\$100,000-\$149,000	4	1	5	10.4
\$150,000-\$200,000	5	1	6	12.5
Over \$200,000	7	15	22	45.8
Sample Size	26	22		
Percent	54.2	45.8		

Chi-square = 13.591 df - 5 Significance = 0.018

Periodical Subscriptions

The number of periodical subscriptions of libraries contained within the learning resource center by geographical area is presented in Table 15. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that the number of periodical subscriptions of the library was associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the western colleges subscribed significantly more often to more than 200 periodicals than did the eastern colleges.

Table 15. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Number of Periodicals to Which Library Subscribes.

Number of Periodical Subscriptions	Geographical Area		Sample Size	Percent
	East	West		
0-24	0	1	1	2.4
25-49	0	1	1	2.4
100-200	8	0	8	19.0
Over 200	18	14	32	76.2
Sample Size	26	16		
Percent	61.9	38.1		

Chi-square = 8.607 df = 3 Significance = 0.035

Reading Instruction

The response by geographical area as to whether instruction in reading is offered by the learning laboratory is presented in Table 16. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that offerings of instruction in reading by a learning laboratory is associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the eastern colleges responded significantly more often that they offered instruction in reading than did the western colleges.

Table 16. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratories Offering Instruction in Reading.

Reading Instruction	Geographical Area East	Geographical Area West	Sample Size	Percent
Yes	21	4	25	89.3
No	0	3	3	10.7
Sample Size	21	7		
Percent	75.0	25.0		

Significance of Chi-square using Fisher's Exact Test = 0.011

df = 1

Speaking Instruction

The response by geographical area as to whether instruction in speaking is offered by the learning laboratory is presented in Table 17. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that offerings of instruction in speaking by a learning laboratory is associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the eastern colleges responded significantly more often that they offered instruction in speaking than did the western colleges.

Table 17. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratories Offering Instruction in Speaking.

Speaking Instruction	Geographical Area East	Geographical Area West	Sample Size	Percent
Yes	19	3	22	91.7
No	0	2	2	8.3
Sample Size	19	5		
Percent	79.2	20.8		

Significance of Chi-square using Fisher's Exact Test = 0.036

df = 1

Tutoring Services

The response by geographical area as to whether tutoring services are offered by the learning laboratory is presented in Table 18. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that offerings of tutoring services by a learning laboratory is associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the eastern colleges responded significantly more often that they had tutoring services than did the western colleges.

Table 18. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratories Offering Tutoring Services.

Tutoring Services	Geographical Area East	West	Sample Size	Percent
Yes	16	1	17	85.0
No	1	2	3	15.0
Sample Size	17	3		
Percent	85.0	15.0		

Significance of Chi-square using Fisher's Exact Test = 0.045

df = 1

Learning Lab Rating

The rating of learning laboratory staff by geographical area is presented in Table 19. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that the rating given to learning laboratory staff is associated with the geographical location.

The data in the table demonstrate that the eastern colleges rated their learning laboratory staff as less adequate significantly more often than did the western colleges.

Table 19. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Learning Laboratory Staff Descriptor.

Staff Descriptor	Geographical Area		Sample Size	Percent
	East	West		
Good	6	2	8	26.7
Adequate	5	7	12	40.0
Less Than Adequate	9	1	10	33.3
Sample Size	20	10		
Percent	66.7	33.3		

Chi-square = 6.075 df = 2 Significance = 0.048

Graphics Production

The number of people involved in graphics materials production by geographical area is presented in Table 20. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that the number of people involved in graphics material production is associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the eastern colleges had a significantly greater number of people involved in graphics material production than did the western colleges.

Table 20. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Number of People Involved in Graphics Material Production.

Graphics	Geographical Area		Sample Size	Percent
	East	West		
1-5	6	12	18	66.7
6-10	7	0	7	25.9
11-15	1	0	1	3.7
Over 25	1	0	1	3.7
Sample Size	15	12		
Percent	55.6	44.4		

Chi-square = 10.800 df = 3 Significance = 0.012

Slides Production Rating

The rating of the slides production staff by geographical area is presented in Table 21. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that the rating given a slides production staff is associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the western colleges rated their slides production staff as superior significantly more often than did the eastern colleges.

Table 21. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Slides Production Staff Descriptor.

Staff Descriptor	Geographical Area East	Geographical Area West	Sample Size	Percent
Superior	4	10	14	31.8
Good	16	9	25	56.8
Adequate	3	0	3	6.8
Less Than Adequate	2	0	2	4.5
Sample Size	25	19		
Percent	56.8	43.2		

Chi-square = 8.878 df = 3 Significance = 0.031

Number of Distributions

The number of distributions (set-ups) per term by geographical area is presented in Table 22. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that the number of distributions per term by audio-visual services is associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the western colleges had a significantly greater number of distributions per term than did the eastern colleges.

Table 22. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Number of Distributions Per Term from the Audio-Visual Section.

Number of Distributions	Geographical Area		Sample Size	Percent
	East	West		
1-100	3	0	3	7.9
101-250	4	0	4	10.5
251-500	6	1	7	18.4
501-1000	4	1	5	13.2
1001-5000	5	9	14	36.8
Over 5000	1	4	5	13.2
Sample Size	23	15		
Percent	60.5	39.5		

Chi-square = 14.262 df = 5 Significance = 0.014

Audio-Visual Services Rating

The rating of audio-visual services by geographical area is presented in Table 23. Because a significant χ^2 ($p < 0.05$) resulted, it can be said that the rating given to audio-visual services is associated with the geographical location. The data in the table demonstrate that the western colleges rated their audio-visual services as superior significantly more often than did the eastern colleges.

Table 23. Frequencies and Chi-Square Value, for the Association of Geographical Area with Audio-Visual Services Descriptors.

Services Descriptors	Geographical Area East	Geographical Area West	Sample Size	Percent
Superior	5	11	16	39.0
Good	15	4	19	46.3
Adequate	4	2	6	14.6
Sample Size	24	17		
Percent	58.5	41.5		

Chi-square = 8.332 df = 2 Significance = 0.016

Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented an analysis of the data with tables which display the findings. Tables 1 through 11 summarize the findings for the entire group of learning resource centers under study, while Tables 12 through 23 contrast the results of those east and west of the Mississippi River. The findings as well as conclusions and recommended guidelines will be presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
AND
RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES

Summary

The study summarized herein was undertaken to determine functional guidelines for the realistic evaluation of learning resource centers in community colleges. The sub-problems in the study were as follows:

1. What were the services provided and administrative arrangements of exemplary learning resource centers in selected comprehensive community colleges of selected states?
2. What guidelines for services and administration of learning resource centers were suggested from a review of the literature and research?
3. What importance was placed upon proposed services by a jury of experts?
4. What impact did regional differences have on existing learning resources programs?
5. What practical guidelines should be used for the realistic evaluation of services of learning resource centers in the comprehensive community college?

An instrument was developed to collect the data. The writer examined the literature/research and, based upon this investigation, designed a questionnaire which would be comprehensive enough to include the diverse and multiple aspects of today's community college learning resources programs.

After careful consideration and with the use of expert opinion, 10 states were chosen from among those with well developed learning resource programs. The 10 states selected were: California, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia and Washington. Each of the 10 state community college directors were asked to nominate those institutions in his/her state which he/she believed had exemplary learning resources programs.

After preliminary letters explaining the study had been mailed, the questionnaires were sent to the 94 community college learning resource center directors who had been nominated. A follow-up letter was sent to the non-respondents after a three week waiting period.

The items on each questionnaire were coded and key punched. In addition to the descriptive statistics, the chi-square statistic was employed to determine if regional differences were significant.

Findings vComponent Facilities

Media production as well as an audio and video tape library was the facility found most often to be a part of existing learning resource centers (96.1 percent). Surprisingly, the library was found to be present only 94.1 percent of the time. Other facilities which were found to be a part of the learning resources program over 90 percent of the time were: photography, film strip library, record library, multi-media production, audio and video tape production and audio-visual services. The learning laboratory (individualized instruction) was present in 84.3 percent of the programs.

Advisory Committees

Over half (65 percent) of the learning resource centers had advisory committees and most (91 percent) of those had faculty serving on those committees.

Administrative Configurations

A clear majority of the learning resource centers (81 percent) function as an independent department while 11 percent function as a subdivision of the library. Most of the centers reported being a part of the division of academic affairs; none reported being under business affairs and five percent were a part of student affairs. Sixty-five percent

indicated that the chief LRC officer reported to the vice president or dean for academic affairs; 13 percent reported directly to the president; four percent reported to the head of student affairs and two percent reported to the chairman of the English department.

Almost all of the learning resource centers (96 percent) reported having a written job description with clearly defined responsibilities for the chief LRC officer.

Ratings

Seventy percent described their learning resources facility as adequate while 28 percent described their facility as too crowded or inadequate. The centers were about equally divided between those who considered the LRC materials and equipment as either limited and appropriate or adequate and appropriate (51 percent) and those who considered their materials and equipment plentiful and well-matched to the college's needs.

Staffing

Over 50 percent indicated a staff of professionals, paraprofessionals, clerical and part-time employees, numbering between one and five. Twenty-five percent reported a professional and paraprofessional staff of between 11 and 25.

Policies

Almost half (48 percent) of the LRC's have a written policy for community service. Over half (51 percent) of the LRC's described their role in providing community service as good or superior. Regular staff meetings were held by 80 percent of the LRC's. Sixty-one percent of the LRC's had staff manuals but only seven percent of these contained policy statements. Seventy-eight percent reported the staff participates in policy sessions, 94 percent in procedural decisions and 57 percent in personnel decisions. Adequate statistics, an LRC handbook and inventory records were reported by over ninety percent of the learning resource centers.

Financing

Over half of the learning resource centers (53 percent) reported a total budget, excluding salaries, of over \$75,000. Fifty-one percent reported that the dean or director of the LRC recommended budget allocations. Of those responding, 65 percent state that internal budget decisions are made by the LRC dean or director.

Most of the responses indicated that less than 10 percent of the budget was spent on the various subdivisions of print media. New requisitions was the only category which differed. Approximately 80 percent of the colleges responding stated that more than 10 percent of the budget was spent on new requisitions. The nearest other items were "planning"

with 36 percent above the 10 percent criterion and "supplies" with 26 percent.

Most learning resource centers responses reported that less than 10 percent of the budget was spent on the various subdivisions of non-print media. New requisitions was the category that had the most responses over the 10 percent criterion. For non-print media though, the allocation (41 percent) was approximately half that for print media. Supplies (39 percent) and maintenance (33 percent) were the next two highest allocations.

Libraries

Almost three-fourths (74 percent) of the libraries used the Library of Congress cataloging system, while only 26 percent used the Dewey Decimal system. All of the libraries reported having a photocopy machine available for use by students. Sixty-five percent have an electronic security system. Half (fifty percent) had between one thousand to ten thousand titles in each satellite collection. Half had over 20,000 titles in each satellite collection. Half (50 percent) could accommodate up to 100 students in each satellite library. Almost half (49 percent) reported having between 25,000 and 50,000 titles in the main collection. Twenty-five percent reported having between 50,000 and 100,000 titles in the main collection. Sixty percent served up to 10,000 students per term in the library. Five percent

reported serving over 80,000 students per term. Seventy-five percent had a clearly defined written statement of purpose for the library staff.

Approximately 50 percent of the respondents stated that the library was not open any time during the weekend. The weekend day on which the library was most frequently open was Saturday (45.3 percent). Only 13 percent of libraries were open on a weekend day after five o'clock in the afternoon.

Learning Laboratories

Over 80 percent of the learning laboratories had between one and five people involved in all job categories. More than 90 percent of the learning laboratories were open both during the day and evening. Sixty-seven percent had a clearly defined written statement of purpose. Eighty percent of the learning laboratories were housed in a specially designed area. Sixty-three percent of the learning laboratories reported being housed in one area, 10 percent in two areas, 17 percent in three areas, three percent in four areas and seven percent in six areas. Fifty percent of the learning laboratories were reported as being housed in facilities which were adequate and comfortable, 22 percent saw their facilities as adequate except for small inconveniences, 19 percent thought the facilities too crowded and uncomfortable and nine percent regarded the learning

laboratory facilities as inadequate. Eighty-three percent indicated their materials and equipment as being adequate or plentiful. Only 27 percent regarded materials and equipment as limited.

Materials Production

Photography, graphics and instructional design were included more than 90 percent of the time. Almost all reported between one and five people in all job categories, except for 18 percent reporting between six and 10 people involved in production. Over half (53 percent) described their materials production facilities as either too crowded and uncomfortable or inadequate. Sixty percent regarded materials and equipment as adequate or plentiful. Fifty-eight percent had a clearly defined written statement of purpose.

Audio-Visual Services

Only four percent indicated the LRC staff responsible for running equipment while 33 percent reported faculty responsible for running equipment. Fifty-one percent own a film cleaning and checking machine. Seventy-four percent have a clearly defined written statement of purpose. All reported having audio-visual services available during the day and 98 percent available at night.

Student Media Lab

No student media lab reported more than three persons staffing the media lab. Fifty percent reported one staff member, 25 percent reported two staff members and 25 percent reported having three staff members. Forty-three percent offer credit for the media lab, and an equal number offer it for non-credit. All reported keeping the media lab open during the day while 86 percent have labs available in the evening. All labs reported having equipment available for student use for slides, video-tape, film production, graphics, photography and television production. Also, all labs reported having a clearly defined written statement of purpose.

Findings Concerning Geographical Differences

The response by geographical area as to whether a learning resource center's advisory committee has student members demonstrates that the eastern colleges had students on advisory committees significantly more often than did the western colleges.

Responses to the instrument indicated that the western colleges had the learning resource center housed in its own building significantly more often than did the eastern colleges.

The study also demonstrated that the western colleges had a significantly larger allocation for salaries than did the eastern colleges.

It was also found that the western colleges subscribed significantly more often to more than 200 periodicals than did the eastern colleges.

On the other hand, however, the responses demonstrate that the eastern colleges responded significantly more often that they offered instruction in reading than did the western colleges. The responses also determined that the eastern colleges responded significantly more often that they offered instruction in speaking than did the western colleges. The study also demonstrated that the eastern colleges responded significantly more often that they had tutoring services than did the western colleges. However, the responses indicated that the eastern colleges rated their learning laboratory staff as less adequate significantly more often than did the western colleges.

In a different category, the study found that the eastern colleges had a significantly greater number of people involved in graphics material production than did the western colleges.

On the other hand, the responses demonstrate that the western colleges rated their slides production staff as superior significantly more often than did the eastern colleges.

In addition, the western colleges had a significantly greater number of distributions per term than did the

eastern colleges. Finally, the responses demonstrated that the western colleges also rated their audio-visual services as superior significantly more often than did the eastern colleges.

Conclusions

As previously discussed, the major purposes of the present investigation were to determine the exact nature of exemplary learning resource centers and to determine whether regional differences have any significant impact on the nature of these centers.

The problem under consideration was to determine functional guidelines for the realistic evaluation of learning resource centers in community colleges. The sub-problems were as follows:

1. What were the services provided and administrative arrangements of exemplary learning resource centers in comprehensive community colleges of selected states?

2. What guidelines for services and administration of learning resource centers were suggested from a review of the literature and research?

3. What importance was placed upon proposed services by a jury of experts?

4. What impact did regional differences have on existing learning resources programs?

5. What practical guidelines should be used for the realistic evaluation of services of learning resource centers in the comprehensive community college?

Sub-problems one through four have been considered in the preceding chapters. The following recommended guidelines are based upon a synthesis of the literature and research and the responses of the jury of experts. In cases where common practice and research recommendations seemed to conflict, the writer made a value judgement using both her own experience in the field and the recommended practices of the experts. For a more specific and detailed review of the exemplary learning resource centers' policies and practices, the reader is invited to re-examine Chapter IV.

Recommended Guidelines

The writer has every reason to believe that the learning resource centers investigated in this study are indeed exemplary. It follows then that the practices they employ and with which they are satisfied would provide a basis for guidelines for other colleges to emulate within the confines of their own particular situations. The writer has attempted to codify the results of her study into a set of guidelines which are readily accessible to those who are concerned with either initiating or improving learning resources programs in the community colleges.

Philosophy

1. Every community college learning resource center should have a written philosophy and stated objectives which reflect institutional goals.
2. Each learning resource center should have integrated services which meet the needs of its own institution.
3. Each learning resources program should evaluate all services and facilities on the basis of their contribution to the instructional program.
4. Every learning resource center should have a fully functioning advisory committee composed of both faculty and students.

Administration

5. The chief learning resources administrator as well as all members of his/her staff should have a written job description with clearly defined responsibilities.
6. Each learning resource center should work toward achieving facilities which are adequate and which best serve its institutional needs.
7. All materials and equipment should be maintained, updated, repaired and added to on a regular periodic basis.

8. All learning resource centers should have a written policy for community service which reflects institutional philosophy.
9. Learning resource centers should have frequent and regularly scheduled staff meetings.
10. Each LRC should have a written manual which includes statements of policy, procedure and general information.
11. Accurate inventory records and usage statistics should be kept by all learning resource centers.

Financing

12. All LRC budget allocations should reflect a fair and proportionate share of the total college budget.
13. Learning resource personnel salaries should be competitive concerning skill required and regional salaries.
14. Budget recommendations for the learning resource center should be made by the chief LRC officer after consultation with the advisory committee and staff.

Libraries

15. New libraries should adopt the Library of Congress cataloging system. Existing libraries should study the ramifications of converting to the

Library of Congress system if they are not already using it.

16. All libraries should have a photocopy machine available for use by students.
17. Faculty and students should be polled to find out if staff, services and titles are adequate.
18. Libraries should be open evenings and weekends to serve the needs of working and/or part-time students.

Learning Laboratories

19. Learning laboratories which offer individualized instruction in reading, speaking, composition, as well as tutoring services, should be a goal, if not a reality, of each learning resources program.

Instructional Design and Development

20. Instructional design and instructional development should be a joint faculty-LRC staff process.

Instructional Support

21. Adequate materials, production facilities, equipment and personnel should be maintained for instructional support.
22. Each learning resource center should provide audio-visual services consistent with instructional needs.

Evaluation

23. All areas of each learning resources program should have yearly goals and yearly evaluation.
24. All areas of each learning resources program should have a systematic way of assessing faculty, student and community needs.
25. All areas of each learning resources program should undergo a self-study at least once every three years.
26. All areas of each learning resources program should develop a plan for improving deficiencies.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER QUESTIONNAIRE
1977

(With Tabulated Responses Where Appropriate)

COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER
QUESTIONNAIRE - 1977

Please complete all questions, if possible. Information about your specific program will not be used separately but will form a part of the total statistical report which will result from this study.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of Community College _____

Address _____

Name and title of person/persons completing survey _____

II. LEARNING RESOURCES PHILOSOPHY

1. Does your LRC program have a written statement of defined purpose and objectives? If so, please state:

2. Our LRC includes:

_____ library (print-media)

_____ learning laboratories
(individualized instruction)

_____ materials production

_____ media production

_____ hardware repair

_____ television studio

_____ automatic retrieval (dial access)

_____ photography

graphics

cinematography: 32 mm, 16 mm, 8 mm
(please specify)

film library

film-strip library

record library

multi-media production

audio-tape and video-tape library

audio and video-tape production

slide processing facilities

student-media facilities

student-media laboratory

audio-visual services

other
(such as computer operation, bookstore, etc.)

3. The above resources are available for direct use by students.

Yes

No

Some

Which? (please specify)

4. Is there an advisory committee for LRC?

65% Yes

35% No

Is it composed of faculty?

91% Yes

9% No

Is it composed of students?

71% Yes

29% No

5. Which statement best describes the administrative configuration at your Community College?

a. 81% Our LRC is an independent department.

Our LRC is a part of the English Department.

_____ Our LRC is a part of the Communications Department.
8% Our LRC is a sub-division of the college library.
11% Other (please specify)

b. 5% Our LRC is a part of student affairs.
0 Our LRC is a part of business affairs.
80% Our LRC is a part of academic affairs.
15% Other (please specify)

c. Our chief LRC officer (Vice-President, Dean, or Director) reports to:

13% President
4% Vice-President or Dean for Student Affairs
0 Vice-President or Dean for Business Affairs
65% Vice-President or Dean for Academic Affairs
2% English Department Chairman
16% Other (please specify)

6. The chief LRC administrator has a written job description with clearly defined responsibilities.
96% Yes
4% No

7. The year in which our LRC was founded is:

8. Our LRC
62% has its own building.
22% is housed in various buildings on campus.

9. Check the one statement that best describes the facilities in which your LRC program is housed:
38% adequate and comfortable
32% adequate except for one or two small inconveniences
10% a bit too crowded, uncomfortable
18% inadequate
2% Other (please specify)

10. The LRC materials and equipment are (check one):
0 outdated and inadequate
23.0% limited, but appropriate
27.5% adequate and appropriate
49.0% plentiful and well matched to the college's needs
_____ Other (please specify)

11. Please specify the number of people who compose your staff in each category:

a. professionals:

52%	1-5
36%	6-10
12%	11-25
0	Other

d. part-time:

67.5%	1-5
10.0%	6-10
17.5%	11-25
5%	Other

(please specify)

(please specify)

b. para-professionals:

59.6%	1-5
23.5%	6-10
12.8%	11-25
2.1%	Other

e. Other:

40%	1-5
20%	6-10
33.3%	11-25
6.7%	Other

(please specify)

(please specify)

c. clerical:

58%	1-5
26%	6-10
16%	11-25
0	Other

(please specify)

12. Does your LRC have a written policy for community service?

24	48%	Yes
26	52%	No

If so, please state: _____

13. Which word best describes your LRC's role in providing services for your community?

12.2%	Superior
38.8%	Good
34.7%	Adequate
12.2%	Less than Adequate
2%	Poor

14. Does your LRC staff have regular meetings?

40	80%	Yes
10	20%	No

15. Does your LRC staff have a staff manual?

31	60.8%	Yes
20	39.2%	No

If so, which of the following does it include?

<u>7.1%</u>	policy statements
<u>35.1%</u>	procedural statements
<u>7.1%</u>	duty assignments
<u>50.0%</u>	general information
<u>Other (please specify)</u>	

16. LRC staff participates in:

<u>78%</u>	policy decisions
<u>94%</u>	procedural decisions
<u>57.1%</u>	personnel decisions

17. LRC staff accumulates adequate statistics?

<u>47</u> <u>92.2%</u>	Yes
<u>4</u> <u>7.8%</u>	No

18. Our LRC offers a written handbook to faculty and students describing services, facilities, materials, equipment, and other pertinent information.

<u>48</u> <u>94.1%</u>	Yes
<u>3</u> <u>5.9%</u>	No

19. Inventory records are maintained on all materials and equipment.

<u>47</u> <u>94%</u>	Yes
<u>3</u> <u>6%</u>	No

III. FINANCING

1. Our total budget allocation (not including salaries) for the year 1976-77 is:

<u>0-\$ 4,999</u>	
<u>2%</u>	\$ 5,000-\$ 9,999
<u>18.4%</u>	\$10,000-\$24,999
<u>6.1%</u>	\$25,000-\$49,999
<u>20.4%</u>	\$50,000-\$75,000
<u>53.1%</u>	Other (please specify)

2. Our LRC total salary budget allocation for the year 1976-77 is:

<u>4.2%</u>	0-\$ 24,999
<u>4.2%</u>	\$ 25,000-\$ 49,999
<u>22.9%</u>	\$ 50,000-\$ 99,999
<u>10.4%</u>	\$100,000-\$149,999
<u>12.5%</u>	\$150,000-\$200,000
<u>45.8%</u>	Other (please specify)

3. Who recommends budget allocations?

<u>8.2%</u>	President
<u>41%</u>	Vice-President or Dean

2. Our LRC total salary budget allocation for the year 1976-77 is:

<u>4.2%</u>	0-\$ 24,999
<u>4.2%</u>	\$ 25,000-\$ 49,999
<u>22.9%</u>	\$ 50,000-\$ 99,000
<u>10.4%</u>	\$100,000-\$149,999
<u>12.5%</u>	\$150,000-\$200,000
<u>45.8%</u>	Other (please specify)

3. Who recommends budget allocations?

<u>8.2%</u>	President
<u>41%</u>	Vice-President or Dean
<u>51%</u>	Dean or Director of LRC
<u>0%</u>	Faculty committee
<u>2%</u>	Student committee
<u>34.7%</u>	Other (please specify)

4. How are LRC internal budget decisions made?

<u>64.9%</u>	LRC Dean or Director decides
<u>27%</u>	LRC staff decides
<u>0</u>	Faculty committee decides
<u>0</u>	Student committee decides
<u>8.1%</u>	Other (please specify)

5. Out of a total of 100%, the following areas receive what per cent of the total LRC budget?

Print Media

<u>New requisitions</u>
<u>Replacement</u>
<u>Maintenance</u>
<u>Supplies</u>
<u>Production</u>
<u>Rental</u>
<u>Planning</u>
<u>Repairs</u>
<u>In-service training</u>
<u>Travel</u>
<u>Contractual services</u>
<u>Evaluation</u>
<u>Other</u>
<u> </u>

Non-Print Media

<u>New requisitions</u>
<u>Replacement</u>
<u>Maintenance</u>
<u>Supplies</u>
<u>Production</u>
<u>Rental</u>
<u>Planning</u>
<u>Repairs</u>
<u>In-service training</u>
<u>Travel</u>
<u>Contractual services</u>
<u>Evaluation</u>
<u>Other</u>
<u> </u>

IV. LIBRARY (Written materials)

If your LRC includes the college library (print-media), please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section V.

1. Approximately what per cent of time is spent in the various areas and approximately what number of people staff the various areas? Choose one of the following for each category:

<u>Time</u>	<u>People</u>
A 1% - 10%	A 1 - 5
B 11% - 25%	B 6 - 10
C 26% - 50%	C 11 - 15
D 50% - 100%	D 16 - 25
	E Other (please specify)

Time	People
_____	Planning
_____	Administrative
_____	Research Assistants
_____	Instructional Design
_____	Acquisitions
_____	Periodical Librarians
_____	Microform
_____	Inter-library Loans
_____	Instruction
_____	Cataloging
_____	Inventory
_____	Clerical
_____	Evaluation
_____	Other (please specify) _____
_____	_____

14. Please estimate the number of students the library serves per term.

18.9%	1- 2,499
18.9%	2,500- 4,999
21.6%	5,000- 9,999
16.2%	10,000-19,999
8.1%	20,000-39,999
10.8%	40,000-80,000
5.4%	Other (please specify)

15. Does the library staff have a clearly defined written statement of purpose?

75%	Yes
25%	No

16. Which best describes how you feel about the library?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
55% Superior	39.5% Superior	28.2% Superior
35% Good	55.3% Good	56.4% Good
7.5% Adequate	2.6% Adequate	10.3% Adequate
2.5% Less than adequate	2.6% Less than adequate	2.6% Less than adequate
— Poor	— Poor	2.6% Poor

17. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the library services at your college.

V. LEARNING LABORATORY (Individualized Instruction)

If your LRC includes the Learning Laboratory, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section VI.

1. Of the staff listed on page 3, item 11, how many people staff the Learning Laboratory in the following areas?

Planning:	Professional:
91.3% 1-5	80.8% 1- 5
8.7% 6-10	19.2% 6-10
— 11-15	— 11-15
— 16-25	— 16-25
— Other	— Other

Administrative:

90%	1-5
10%	6-10
	11-15
	16-25
	Other

Para-professional:

88.5%	1- 5
11.5%	6-10
	11-15
	16-25
	Other

Clerical:

86.7%	1- 5
6.7%	6-10
	11-15
6.7%	16-25
	Other

Evaluation:

80%	1- 5
13.3%	6-10
	11-15
	16-25
6.7%	Other

Part-time:

90%	1- 5
5%	6-10
	11-15
	16-25
5%	Other

2. Please check the areas in which your Learning Laboratory offers instruction, the type of instruction used, and the number of students per term from the following areas:

Reading:

_____	Yes
_____	No

If yes:

_____	Credit
_____	Non-credit
_____	Remedial
_____	Developmental
_____	1- 100 students
_____	101- 200 students
_____	201- 400 students
_____	401- 800 students
_____	801-1600 students
_____	Other

Speaking:

_____	Yes
_____	No

If yes:

_____	Credit
_____	Non-credit
_____	Remedial
_____	Developmental
_____	1- 100 students
_____	101- 200 students
_____	201- 400 students
_____	401- 800 students
_____	801-1600 students
_____	Other

Composition:

_____	Yes
_____	No

If yes:

Media:

_____	Yes
_____	No

If yes:

Credit
 Non-credit
 Remedial
 Developmental
 1- 100 students
 101- 200 students
 201- 400 students
 401- 800 students
 801-1600 students
 Other

Mathematics:

Yes
 No
If yes:

Credit
 Non-credit
 Remedial
 Developmental
 1- 100 students
 101- 200 students
 201- 400 students
 401- 800 students
 801-1600 students
 Other

Science:

Yes
 No
If yes:

Credit
 Non-credit
 Remedial
 Developmental
 1- 100 students
 101- 200 students
 201- 400 students
 401- 800 students
 801-1600 students
 Other

Study Skills:

Yes
 No
If yes:

Credit
 Non-credit
 Remedial
 Developmental
 1- 100 students
 101- 200 students
 201- 400 students
 401- 800 students
 801-1600 students
 Other

Vocabulary Development

Yes
 No
If yes:

Credit
 Non-credit
 Remedial
 Developmental
 1- 100 students
 101- 200 students
 201- 400 students
 401- 800 students
 801-1600 students
 Other

Spelling:

Yes
 No
If yes:

Credit
 Non-credit
 Remedial
 Developmental
 1- 100 students
 101- 200 students
 201- 400 students
 401- 800 students
 801-1600 students
 Other

Instructional Design:

Yes
 No
If yes:

<u>Credit</u>	<u>Credit</u>
<u>Non-credit</u>	<u>Non-credit</u>
<u>Remedial</u>	<u>Remedial</u>
<u>Developmental</u>	<u>Developmental</u>
1- 100 students	1- 100 students
101- 200 students	101- 200 students
201- 400 students	201- 400 students
401- 800 students	401- 800 students
801-1600 students	801-1600 students
Other	Other
<u>Diagnostic/Prescriptive</u>	
<u>Counseling</u>	
<u>Yes</u>	<u>Tutoring</u>
<u>No</u>	
<u>If yes:</u>	
<u>Credit</u>	<u>Credit</u>
<u>Non-credit</u>	<u>Non-credit</u>
<u>Remedial</u>	<u>Remedial</u>
<u>Developmental</u>	<u>Developmental</u>
1- 100 students	1- 100 students
101- 200 students	101- 200 students
201- 400 students	201- 400 students
401- 800 students	401- 800 students
801-1600 students	801-1600 students
Other	Other

3. Is the Learning Laboratory open during the day?

96.9% Yes
3.1% No

and/or evening?

93.3% Yes
6.7% No

4. Does the Learning Laboratory have a clearly defined written statement of purpose?

66.7% Yes
33.3% No

5. Is the Learning Laboratory housed in a specially designed area?

80% Yes
20% No

6. In how many areas is the Learning Laboratory housed?

(1)63.3 (2)10.0 (please specify) (3)16.7 (4)3.3 (6) 6.7

7. Check the one statement that best describes the facilities in which your Learning Laboratory program is housed:

50%	adequate and comfortable
21.9%	adequate except for one or two small inconveniences
18.8%	a bit too crowded, uncomfortable
9.4%	inadequate
<hr/> Other	

8. The Learning Laboratory materials and equipment are (check one):

outdated and inadequate	
26.7%	limited, but appropriate
40.0%	adequate and appropriate
33.3%	plentiful and well matched to college's needs
<hr/> Other (please specify)	

9. Which best describes your Learning Laboratory:

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
51.7% Superior	37.9% Superior	31% Superior
34.5% Good	48.3% Good	51.7% Good
3.4% Adequate	3.4% Adequate	10.3% Adequate
6.9% Less than adequate	6.9% Less than adequate	6.9% Less than adequate
3.4% Poor	3.4% Poor	<hr/> Poor

10. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the Learning Laboratory service at your college:

VI. MATERIALS PRODUCTION

If your LRC includes Materials Production, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section VII.

1. Please check which of the following is included in Materials Production, how many people comprise each area (1 -, 6 - 10, 11 - 15, 16 - 25, Other), and total production per each term of each area:

Large offset:

37%	Yes
63%	No

If yes:

Instructional design:

93.5%	Yes
6.5%	No

If yes:

<u> </u> No. of people	<u> </u> No. of people
<u> </u> Production	<u> </u> Production
Small offset:	
<u> 35%</u> Yes	<u> 80%</u> Yes
<u> 64%</u> No	<u> 20%</u> No
If yes:	If yes:
<u> </u> No. of people	<u> </u> No. of people
<u> </u> Production	<u> </u> Production
Mimeograph:	
<u> 29.2%</u> Yes	<u> 56%</u> Yes
<u> 70.8%</u> No	<u> 44%</u> No
If yes:	If yes:
<u> </u> No. of people	<u> </u> No. of people
<u> </u> Production	<u> </u> Production
Ditto:	
<u> 39.1%</u> Yes	<u> 48.1%</u> Yes
<u> 60.9%</u> No	<u> 51.9%</u> No
If yes:	If yes:
<u> </u> No. of people	<u> </u> No. of people
<u> </u> Production	<u> </u> Production
Plate making:	
<u> 48.1%</u> Yes	<u> 10%</u> Yes
<u> 51.9%</u> No	<u> 90%</u> No
If yes:	If yes:
<u> </u> No. of people	<u> </u> No. of people
<u> </u> Production	<u> </u> Production
Photography:	<u>Other:</u>
<u> 97.2%</u> Yes	<u> </u>
<u> 2.8%</u> No	<u> </u>
If yes:	<u> </u>
<u> </u> No. of people	<u> </u>
<u> </u> Production	<u> </u>
Graphics:	
<u> 97.1%</u> Yes	<u> </u>
<u> 2.9%</u> No	<u> </u>
If yes:	<u> </u>
<u> </u> No. of people	<u> </u>
<u> </u> Production	<u> </u>

2. Of your total number of Materials Production staff, how many are:

Professional
Supportive

3. How many people devote their time to:

Planning:
93.8% 1- 5
3.1% 6-10
3.1% 11-15
16-25
Other

Production:
75.8% 1- 5
18.2% 6-10
6.1% 11-15
16-25
Other

Administration:
96.9% 1-5
6-10
3.1% 11-15
16-25
Other

Clerical:
93.5% 1- 5
3.2% 6-10
11-15
16-25
3.2% Other

Management:
93.9% 1- 5
6-10
6.1% 11-15
16-25
Other

Evaluation:
96% 1- 5
6-10
4% 11-15
16-25
Other

4. Check the one statement that best describes the facilities in which your Materials Production program is housed.

30.8% adequate and comfortable
15.4% adequate except for one or two small inconveniences
38.5% a bit too crowded, uncomfortable
Other

5. The Materials Production materials and equipment are (check one):

outdated and inadequate
39.5% limited, but appropriate
39.5% adequate and appropriate
21.2% plentiful and well matched to college's needs
Other

6. Does Materials Production staff have a clearly defined written statement of purpose?

57.9% Yes
42.1% No

7. Which best describes your Materials Production program:

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
43.2% Superior	43.2% Superior	35.1% Superior
40.5% Good	40.5% Good	37.8% Good
5.4% Adequate	13.5% Adequate	18.9% Adequate
10.8% Less than adequate	2.7% Less than adequate	8.1% Less than adequate
Other	Other	Other

8. Please state what you think would do the most to improve Materials Production service at your college.

VII. MEDIA PRODUCTION

If your LRC includes Media Production, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section VIII.

1. What percentage of time is spent in the various areas and approximately what number of people staff the various areas? Choose one of the following for each category:

A 1% - 10%	A 1 - 5
B 11% - 25%	B 6 - 10
C 26% - 50%	C 11 - 15
C 50% - 100%	D 16 - 25
	E Other (please specify)

A. Slides

Time
People
Black & White (yes, no)
Color (yes, no)
Own Processing (yes, no)

1. Which best describes how you feel about slide production at your college?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
31.8% Superior	29.5% Superior	43.2% Superior
56.8% Good	52.3% Good	34.1% Good
6.8% Adequate	11.4% Adequate	15.9% Adequate
4.5% Less than adequate	6.8% Less than adequate	6.8% Less than adequate
Poor	Poor	Poor

2. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the Video-tape service at your college.

B. Video-tape (off the air)

Time
 People
 Number of VTR's

1. Which best describes how you feel about the video-tape services at your college?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
28.9% Superior	26.3% Superior	26.3% Superior
39.5% Good	44.7% Good	42.1% Good
23.7% Adequate	23.7% Adequate	21.1% Adequate
7.9% Less than adequate	5.3% Less than adequate	10.5% Less than adequate
Poor	Poor	Poor

2. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the Video-tape service at your college.

C. Audio-tape

Time
 People
 1-9 Number of high-speed duplicators
 1-9 Number of simultaneous duplications

1. Which best describes how you feel about the audio-tape services at your college?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
43.9% Superior	39% Superior	39% Superior
48.8% Good	48.8% Good	48.8% Good
4.9% Adequate	9.8% Adequate	12.2% Adequate
2.4% Less than adequate	2.4% Less than adequate	Less than adequate
Poor	Poor	Poor

2. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the cinematography services at your college.

D. Cinematography

1-10	100%	Time
1- 5		People
78.6 Yes	21.4 No	8 mm, 16 mm, and/or 32 mm (please specify)
92.1 Yes	7.1 No	Black & White (yes, no)
7.7 Yes	92.3 No	Color (yes, no)
	100%	Own processing (yes, no)
		Editing (yes, no)

1. Which best describes how you feel about cinematography at your college?

	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
21.4%	Superior	21.4% Superior	14.3% Superior
7.1%	Good	14.3% Good	21.4% Good
50%	Adequate	35.7% Adequate	42.9% Adequate
21.4%	Less than adequate	28.6% Less than adequate	21.4% Less than adequate
	Poor	Poor	Poor

2. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the cinematography services at your college.

E. Graphics

_____	Time
_____	People
_____	Animation (yes, no)
Yes 100%	Black & White (yes, no)
Yes 94.3%	Color (yes, no)
No 5.7%	Color (yes, no)
Yes 100%	Graphics (yes, no; Black & White or Color?)

1. Which best describes how you feel about Graphics at your college?

	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
47.4%	Superior	36.8%	Superior
31.6%	Good	42.1%	Good
13.2%	Adequate	13.2%	Adequate
7.9%	Less than adequate	7.9%	Less than adequate
	Poor		Poor

2. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the Graphics services at your college.

F. Photography

	Time
<u>100%</u> Yes	Black & White (yes, no)
	Color (yes, no)
	Own processing (yes, no)

1. Which best describes how you feel about photography at your college?

	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
38.5%	Superior	32.5%	Superior
46.2%	Good	55%	Good
10.3%	Adequate	7.5%	Adequate
5.1%	Less than adequate	5%	Less than adequate
	Poor		Poor

2. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the photography services at your college.

G. Television Production

	Time
	People
	Do you have your own TV studio (yes, no)

Closed circuit transmission:

Yes	85.2%	No	14.8%
Black & White (yes, no)			
Yes	83.3%	No	16.7%
Color (yes, no)			
Yes	70%	No	30%
Live (yes, no)			
Yes	89.7%	No	10.3%
Tape (yes, no)			

Remote location:

Yes	80%	No	20%
Black & White (yes, no)			
Yes	61.5%	No	38.5%
Color (yes, no)			
Yes	40.9%	No	59.1%
Live (yes, no)			
Yes	80.8%	No	19.2%
Tape (yes, no)			

Cable transmission:

Yes	45.5%	No	54.5%
Black & White (yes, no)			
Yes	50%	No	50%
Color (yes, no)			
Yes	31.8%	No	68.2%
Live (yes, no)			
Yes	50%	No	50%
Tape (yes, no)			

1. Which best describes how you feel about the television production at your college?

Staff	Services	Materials
32.3% Superior	32.3% Superior	32.3% Superior
35.5% Good	35.5% Good	35.5% Good
22.6% Adequate	22.6% Adequate	19.4% Adequate
9.7% Less than adequate	9.7% Less than adequate	19.9% Less than adequate
Poor	Poor	Poor

2. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the television production at your college.

3. Of your total number of media production staff, how many are:

Professional
Supportive

4. Does the media production staff have a clearly defined, written statement of purpose?

69.7%	Yes
36.3%	No

VIII. AUTOMATIC RETRIEVAL (Dial Access)

If your LRC includes automatic retrieval, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section IX.

1. How many receiving locations do you house on campus?
1-85
2. How many separate programs can be broadcast simultaneously?
1-3 Audio
 Video
3. How many programs per term would you estimate you transmit through the system?
4. Which best describes how you feel about automatic retrieval services at your college?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
<u>11.1%</u> Superior	<u>10%</u> Superior	<u>20%</u> Superior
<u>33.3%</u> Good	<u>50%</u> Good	<u>20%</u> Good
<u>33.3%</u> Adequate	<u>30%</u> Adequate	<u>40%</u> Adequate
<u>22.2%</u> Less than adequate	<u>10%</u> Less than adequate	<u>10%</u> Less than adequate
<u> </u> Poor	<u> </u> Poor	<u> </u> Poor

5. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the automatic retrieval system at your college.

IX. NON-PRINT LIBRARY

If your LRC includes the Non-Print Library, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section X.

1. What percentage of time is spent in the various areas and approximately what number of people staff the various areas? Also, indicate the number of titles and rentals per term in the various areas. Choose one of the following for each area:

<u>TIME</u>	<u>PEOPLE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF TITLES</u>	<u>RENTALS PER TERM</u>
A 1 - 10%	A 1 - 5	A 1 - 50	A 1 - 50
B 11 - 25%	B 6 - 10	B 51 - 100	B 51 - 100
C 26 - 50%	C 11 - 15	C 101 - 250	C 101 - 250
D 51 - 100%	D 16 - 25	D 251 - 500	D 501 - 1000

	<u>TIME</u>	<u>PEOPLE</u>	<u>TITLES</u>	<u>RENTALS</u>
Record Library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Audio-tape Library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Video-tape Library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Slide Library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Film Library	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. Does the Non-Print Library staff have a clearly defined, written statement of purpose?

64.5% Yes
35.5% No

3. Which best describes how you feel about the Non-Print Library at your college?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
33.3% Superior	27.8% Superior	30.6% Superior
52.8% Good	52.8% Good	50% Good
11.1% Adequate	13.9% Adequate	16.7% Adequate
2.8% Less than adequate	5.6% Less than adequate	2.8% Less than adequate
Poor	Poor	Poor

4. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the Non-Print Library at your college.

X. MULTI-MEDIA (slide-tape programs)

If your LRC includes the Multi-Media program, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section XI.

1. Is the Multi-Media Program for:
 96.3% Yes 3.7% No LRC use?
100% Yes faculty use?
 72% Yes 28% No student use?
 58.3% Yes 41.7% No credit?
62.5% Yes 37.5% No non-credit?
2. How many people staff this program?
1-8
3. Of your total multi-media staff, how many are:
1-3 Professional
1-7 Supportive
4. Does your multi-media staff have a clearly defined, written statement of purpose?
 63.6% Yes
36.4% No
5. Which best describes how you feel about the multi-media programs at your college?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
30.4% Superior	34.8% Superior	26.1% Superior
56.5% Good	47.8% Good	52.2% Good
<u>13%</u> Adequate	<u>17.4%</u> Adequate	<u>21.7%</u> Adequate
Less than adequate	Less than adequate	Less than adequate
Poor	Poor	Poor

6. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the multi-media programs at your college.

XI. AUDIO-VISUAL SERVICES

If your LRC includes Audio-Visual Services, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section and proceed to section XII.

1. Who runs the equipment?
 32.6% faculty
2.2% students
4.3% LRC staff

2. What percentage of time is spent in the various areas and approximately what number of people staff the various areas? Choose one of the following for each area:

TIME

A 1 - 10%
 B 11 - 25%
 C 26 - 50%
 D 51 - 100%

PEOPLE

A 1 - 5
 B 6 - 10
 C 11 - 15
 D 16 - 25
 E Other (please specify)

Scheduling:

 Time
 People

Repair (Major):

 Time
 People

Distributions (set-ups):

 Time
 People

Repair (Minor):

 Time
 People

Troubleshooting:

 Time
 People

Sound System (microphones,
amplifiers, etc.):

 Time
 People

Maintenance:

 Time
 People

Inventory:

 Time
 People

3. Do you own your own film-cleaning and checking machine?

 51.2% Yes
 48.8% No

4. The number of distributions (set-ups) per term is:

 1 - 100
 101 - 250
 251 - 500
 501 - 1,000
 1,001 - 5,000
 Other (please specify)

5. Of your total staff of audio-visual services, how many are:
 Professional
 Supportive

6. Does your audio-visual services have a clearly defined, written statement of purpose?
74.4% Yes
25.6% No

7. Are the audio-visual services available during the day?
100% Yes
 No

and/or evening?
97.7% Yes
2.3% No

8. Which best describes how you feel about the audio-visual services at your college?

	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
39%	Superior	39%	Superior
43.9%	Good	46.3%	Good
17.1%	Adequate	14.6%	Adequate
	Less than adequate		Less than adequate
	Poor		Poor

9. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the audio-visual services at your college.

XII. STUDENT-MEDIA LAB

If your LRC includes Student-Media Lab, please respond to the following questions. If not, please disregard this section.

1. How many people staff the Media Lab?
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 Other (please specify)

2. Is the Media Lab for:

42.9% Credit
42.9% Non-credit

3. Is the Media Lab available during the day?

100% Yes
 No

and/or evening?

85.7% Yes
14.3% No

4. Check which of the following areas are available for direct student hands-on use:

		<u>Processing</u>	<u>Editing</u>
<u>100%</u> Yes	Slides	Yes	<u>100%</u>
<u>100%</u> Yes	Video-tape		<u>100%</u>
<u>100%</u> Yes	Film Production		<u>100%</u>
<u>100%</u> Yes	Art (graphics)		<u>100%</u>
<u>100%</u> Yes	Photography		<u>100%</u>
<u>100%</u> Yes	Television Production		<u>100%</u>
<u>100%</u> Yes	Other (please specify)		<u>100%</u>

5. Does your Student Media Lab have a clearly defined, written statement of purpose?

100% Yes
 No

6. What best describes how you feel about the Student Media Lab at your college?

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Materials</u>
<u>28.6%</u> Superior	<u>50%</u> Superior	<u>66.7%</u> Superior
<u>28.6%</u> Good	<u>16.9%</u> Good	<u>16.7%</u> Good
<u>42.9%</u> Adequate	<u>33.3%</u> Adequate	<u>16.7%</u> Adequate
<u> </u> Less than adequate	<u> </u> Less than adequate	<u> </u> Less than adequate
<u> </u> Poor	<u> </u> Poor	<u> </u> Poor

7. Please state what you think would do the most to improve the Student Media Lab at your college.

XIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Your generous cooperation in completeing the above questionnaire is deeply appreciated. Please return to:

Ms. Mary Ann Linzmayer
Santa Fe Community College
Post Office Box 1530
3000 N.W. 83 Street
Gainesville, FL 32602

APPENDIX B
LETTERS OF REQUEST

P.O. Box 1530
Gainesville, FL 32602

November 8, 1976

Dear _____:

I am conducting a survey of community college learning resource centers in states which have well-developed community college programs. The results of this investigation will be used to develop a set of criteria to be used as guidelines in the evaluation of services of learning resource centers in comprehensive community colleges.

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute for Higher Education, University of Florida, has suggested that I ask you to nominate the community colleges in your state which have exemplary learning resource centers. A questionnaire will then be mailed to the heads of those learning resource centers named by you.

Your help in sending me the names of the exemplary centers will be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(Ms.) Mary Ann Linzmayer
University of Florida

P.O. Box 1530
Gainesville, FL 32602

May 11, 1977

Dear _____:

has nominated your institution as one with an exemplary learning resource center. As director of the center your opinions regarding a learning resource center that genuinely fills the needs of the institution it serves would be especially valuable.

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute for Higher Education, University of Florida, has indicated a need to determine those factors which constitute a good learning resource center. I am conducting a survey of community college learning resource centers, and I hope to use the results of this investigation to develop guidelines for the evaluation of such centers.

Within the next few weeks, you will receive a questionnaire designed to elicit descriptions of existing conditions at your learning resource center. Without your responses to these questions, no such guidelines could ever be developed. The comprehensive nature of the learning resource program necessitates a lengthy questionnaire. However, the answers, for the most part, require only a check mark. It is my sincere belief that the time you spend completing this questionnaire will help produce an effective tool for evaluation.

Any suggestions which you may have concerning this research will be most welcome and greatly appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ms. Mary Ann Linzmayer
Santa Fe Community College

P.O. Box 1530
Gainesville, FL 32602

May 18, 1977

Dear _____:

A short time ago you received a letter describing the enclosed learning resources questionnaire. As you may remember, we hope to use the answers to the questions to develop guidelines for the evaluation of learning resource centers.

Since your center has been designated as one that genuinely fills the needs of the institution it serves, your responses will be particularly helpful.

I would very much appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope within the next two weeks. A summary of the findings will be sent to you as the study is completed.

I sincerely appreciate your prompt attention and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ms. Mary Ann Linzmayer
Santa Fe Community College

P.O. Box 1530
Gainesville, FL 32602

June 15, 1977

Dear _____:

A few weeks ago, you received a letter and a questionnaire concerning the role of the learning resources center at your college. I would very much appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience. Your help will be a valuable addition to the investigation.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this study. A second copy of the questionnaire is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Ms. Mary Ann Linzmayer
Santa Fe Community College

APPENDIX C
PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

CALIFORNIA

DeAnza College
21260 Stevens Creek Road
Cupertino, CA 95014

Fullerton College
321 East Chapman Avenue
Fullerton, CA 92634

Los Angeles Pierce College
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91371

Los Angeles Mission College
1101 San Fernando Road
San Fernando, CA 91340

Pasadena City College
1570 East Colorado Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91106

Solano Community College
Suisan Valley Road
P.O. Box 246
Suisan City, CA 94585

College of San Mateo
1700 West Hillsdale Blvd.
San Mateo, CA 94402

William Rainey Harper College
Algonquin and Roselle Roads
Palatine, IL 60067

Waubonsee Community College
Route 47 at Harter Road
Sugar Grove, IL 60554

MICHIGAN

Charles S. Mott Community College
Flint, MI 58402

Grand Rapids Junior College
143 Bostwick Street, N.E.
Grand Rapids, MI 49502

Lansing Community College
430 North Capitol Avenue
Lansing, MI 48914

MISSISSIPPI

Utica Junior College
Utica, MS 39175

Mississippi Delta Junior College
Moorhead, MS 38761

ILLINOIS

Illinois Central College
P.O. Box 2400
East Peoria, IL 61635

Illinois Valley Community College
Rural Route #1
Oglesby, IL 61348

Parkland College
2400 West Bradley Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Oakton Community College
7900 North Nagle Avenue
Morton Grove, IL 60053

NEW YORK

Genesee Community College
College Road
P.O. Box 718
Batavia, NY 14020

Fashion Institute of Technology
227 West 27th Street
New York, NY 10001

Corning Community College
Corning, NY 14830

NORTH CAROLINA

Davidson County Community College
P.O. Box 1287
Lexington, NC 27292

Guilford Technical Institute
P.O. Box 309
Jamestown, NC 27282

Pamlico Technical Institute
P.O. Box 1215
Alliance, NC 28509

Wayne Community College
P.O. Drawer 1878
Goldsboro, NC 27530

Wilson County Technical Institute
P.O. Box 4305
Woodard Station
Wilson, NC 27893

Wilkes Community College
P.O. Drawer 120
Wilkesboro, NC 28697

Northampton County Area Community
College
3835 Green Pond Road
Bethlehem, PA 18017

Montgomery County Community College
340 DeKalb Pike
Blue Bell, PA 19422

Luzerne County Community College
Prospect Street and Middle Road
Nanticoke, PA 18634

Delaware County Community College
Route 252 and Media Line Road
Media, PA 19063

Bucks County Community College
Swamp Road
Newtown, PA 18940

PENNSYLVANIA

Community College of Allegheny County
(Allegheny Campus)
808 Ridge Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Community College of Allegheny County
(College Center-North)
111 Pines Plaza, 1130 Perry Highway
Pittsburgh, PA 15237

Community College of Allegheny County
(Boyce Campus)
595 Beatty Road
Monroeville, PA 15146

Community College of Allegheny County
(South Campus)
1750 Clairton Road
West Mifflin, PA 15122

Williamsport Area Community College
1005 West Third Street
Williamsport, PA 17701

Westmoreland County Community College
College Station
Youngwood, PA 15697

TEXAS

McLennan County Community College
Waco, TX 76708

El Centro College
Main and Lamar
Dallas, TX 74202

Tarrant County Junior College
North East Campus
Fort Worth, TX 76102

VIRGINIA

New River Community College
State Route 100
Drawer 1127
Dublin, VA 24084

John Tyler Community College
U.S. 1 - 301
Chester, VA 23831

Central Virginia Community College
Wards Road South (U.S. 29, South)
P.O. Box 4098
Lynchburg, VA 24502

Thomas Nelson Community College
99 Thomas Nelson Drive
P.O. Box 9407
Hampton, VA 23670

Tidewater Community College
Virginia Beach Campus
1700 College Crescent
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

Tidewater Community College
Frederick Campus
Portsmouth, VA 23703

WASHINGTON

Shoreline Community College
16101 Greenwood Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98133

Fort Steilacoom Community College
P.O. Box 3186
Tacoma, WA 98499

Green River Community College
12401 S.E. 320th Street
Auburn, WA 98002

REFERENCES ✓

American Library Association. Standards for College Libraries. Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1959.

Association of College and Research Libraries. Committee on Liaison with Accrediting Agencies. "Guide to Methods of Library Evaluation," College and Research Libraries News, (October, 1968).

Association of College and Research Libraries. "Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning Resources Programs," College and Research Libraries News, (December, 1972).

Brophy, John W., "Multi-Media Instruction for an Introduction to Business," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 9 (June/July 1972).

California Community Colleges. "Guidelines for a Non-Print Materials Core in a Learning Resource Program." Sacramento: Office of the Chancellor, 1973.

Clapp, Verner W. and Jordan, Robert T. "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections," College and Research Libraries, (September, 1965).

Clark, A. S. and Hirschman, R., "Using the 'Guidelines'" A Study of the State-Supported Two Year College Libraries in Ohio," College and Research Libraries Vol. 36, No. 5 (September 1975).

Clinton, Robert L. "New Resources for Learning," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 9, (June/July 1972).

Connelly, J. G., and Sepe, Thomas D. "Individualized Instruction: Are Students Ready?," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 6, (March 1973).

Culkins, John. "From Film Studies to Media Studies," Media and Methods, Volume 11, No. 4, (December 1974).

Davies, Ruth. The School Library Media Center: A Force for Educational Excellence, (2nd Ed.), R. R. Bowker Company, Michigan, (1974).

Devirian, M. C., Enright, G. and Smith, Guy. "A Survey of Learning Program Centers in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education." Research in Education. February 1976.

Ducheny, Martin. "The Sword in the Stone," Media and Methods, Volume 11, No. 5 (January 1975).

Ducote, Richard. "The Learning Resource Center: Concepts and Designs." Paper presented at the meetings "The Learning Resource Center of the Two Year College," Conference. Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina June 6-10, 1970.

Ducote, Richard. "Promoting Media Utilization." Paper presented at "The Learning Resource Center of the Two Year College" Conference. Appalachian University, Boone, North Carolina. June 6-July 10, 1970.

Enright, Gwyn. "College Learning Skills: Frontierland Origins of the Learning Assistance Center." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western College Reading Association, Anaheim, California. March 20-22, 1975.

"Educational Media Programs in Junior Colleges." By the Audio-visual Standards Committee of the Community-Junior College Library Administrators. November, 1968. Auram Rosenthal, Chairman.

Hempstead, Ross R. "A/V: The Hot Media Gets Hotter on Campuses," College and University Business, Vol. 55, No. 4, (October 1973).

Implementing Instructional Development Through Learning Resource Programs. Proc. of a Conference. League for Innovation in the Community College, Los Angeles, California, 1974.

Lewis, John. "A Comparison of the 1960 Standards and 1972 Guidelines for Community College Libraries," January 27, 1975, unpublished.

Lowndes, Dougals. Film Making in Schools. Watson-Guptill Publications, New York, (1970).

Michael, Mary Ellen. "Planning and Evaluating Library System Service in Illinois Using the CIPP Model." Paper Presented to the First Annual CLENE Assembly, Chicago, January 23, 1976.

Middle States Association of College and Secondary Schools. Commission on Higher Education. The Library or Learning Resources Center. New York: Middle States Association of College and Secondary Schools, 1971.

New England Association of College and Secondary Schools, Inc. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Standards for Membership. Boston, Massachusetts: New England Association of College and Secondary Schools, Inc., 1970.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Guide for the Evaluation of Institutions of Higher Education, Revised Edition. Chicago, Illinois: North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1965.

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools. Commission on Higher Schools. Manual of Standards and Guide for Self-Study for Accreditation of Higher Schools. Seattle, Washington: Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, 1970.

Peterson, Gary T. "An Analysis of the Learning Center in Community Colleges." Research in Education, November 1974.

Peterson, Gary T. "The Comprehensive Learning Center," New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 3, No. 1, Spring 1975,

Peterson, Gary T. "Conceptualizing the Learning Center," Research in Education, May, 1975.

Piazza, Charles J. "Learning Resource Programs for Two-Year Colleges: A State of the Art," Research in Education, March 1975.

Raines, Max R. "A Survey of Leading Library/LRC's," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43, No. 9 (June/July 1973).

Ross, T. J. Film and the Liberal Arts. Holt-Rinehart and Winston, New York, (1970).

See, Sarah G. "Implementing the Learning Resources Center--Who, Where, How and With What?" Paper Presented to Western College Reading Association, Oakland, California. (April, 1974).

Shifrin, Malcolm. Information on the School Library: An Introduction to the Organization of Non-Book Materials, Shoe String Press, Inc., Connecticut, (August, 1974).

Skinner, R. F. "Some Implications of Making Education More Efficient." National Society for the Study of Education, NSSE Yearbook, 72nd Ed., Pt. 1, p. 446-456.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Standards of the College Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972.

Totten, Herman L. "Identification of Library Elements in Statements of Accrediting Standards: A Review of the Literature." Association of College and Research Libraries. Chicago, March 1974.

University of Florida. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Learning Resources Centers," Canfield, Cate, Small, Wattenbarger, (December, 1971), Unpublished.

Voegel, George H. "Some Value Considerations," New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1975).

Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. Handbook of Accreditation. Burlingame, California: Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 1973.

William Rainey Harper College. LRC Goals 73/74, William Rainey Harper College, Illinois, (July 1974).

Yates, Dudley. "The Impact of Regional Accrediting Agencies Upon Libraries in Post-Secondary Education." Paper Presented at the 27th Biennial Conference of Southeastern Library Association. Knoxville, Tennessee. (November 3-6, 1976).

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Mary Ann Kane Linzmayer was born in Staten Island, New York on July 23, 1936. She attended parochial schools in Glen Cove, New York, and Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and was graduated from Fort Lauderdale High School. She entered the University of Florida in 1954 and was graduated in 1958 with a B.A.E. in English education. She studied drama in New York for a year and then began teaching at Olsen Junior High School in Dania, Florida. After four years, she returned to the University of Florida and completed the M.Ed. in English education. For three years she taught reading at Buchholz and Westwood Junior High Schools in Gainesville, Florida. In 1967, she opened the learning laboratory at Santa Fe Community College, and in 1971, assumed the position of Director for Learning Resources. In 1975, she returned to the classroom where she now serves as a teacher of English at Santa Fe Community College.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ralph B. Kimbrough
Ralph B. Kimbrough, Chairman
Professor of Educational
Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James L. Wattenbarger
James L. Wattenbarger,
Professor of Educational
Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

William C. Childers
William C. Childers
Professor of English

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June 1978

Dean, Graduate School

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 08552 7959